

SERRE WEIGHTS AND BREUIL'S LATTICE CONJECTURE IN DIMENSION THREE

DANIEL LE, BAO V. LE HUNG, BRANDON LEVIN, AND STEFANO MORRA

ABSTRACT. We prove in generic situations that the lattice in a tame type induced by the completed cohomology of a $U(3)$ -arithmetic manifold is purely local, i.e., only depends on the Galois representation at places above p . This is a generalization to GL_3 of the lattice conjecture of Breuil. In the process, we also prove the geometric Breuil–Mézard conjecture for (tamely) potentially crystalline deformation rings with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$ as well as the Serre weight conjectures of [Her09] over an unramified field extending the results of [LLHLM]. We also prove results in modular representation theory about lattices in Deligne–Luzstig representations for the group $GL_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Breuil's lattice conjecture	3
1.2. Serre weight and Breuil–Mézard conjectures	5
1.3. Representation theory results	6
1.4. Notation	7
2. Extension graph	10
2.1. Definition and properties of the extension graph	10
2.2. Combinatorics of types and Serre weights	14
3. Serre weight conjectures	21
3.1. Étale φ -modules with descent data	21
3.2. Semisimple Kisin modules	24
3.3. Shapes and Serre weights	27
3.4. Serre weight conjectures	31
3.5. The geometric Breuil–Mézard conjecture	37
4. Lattices in types	50
4.1. General setting and main result	51
4.2. Proof of the structure theorem for defect zero weights	63
4.3. Proof of the structure theorem in the general case	72
5. Breuil's Conjectures	84

5.1. Ideal relations in deformation rings	84
5.2. Cyclicity for patching functors	88
5.3. Gauges for patching functors	94
5.4. Global applications	95
References	101

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most important developments in the Langlands program in recent years has been the p -adic local Langlands correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. Unfortunately, extending this correspondence even to $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ has proven to be exceedingly difficult and all evidence suggests that the desired correspondence will be much more complicated. On the other hand, there has been some progress on several avatars of the p -adic local Langlands correspondence, namely, (generalized) Serre weight conjectures, geometric Breuil–Mézard conjecture, and Breuil’s lattice conjecture. These conjectures inform our understanding of what the sought after p -adic correspondence should look like. In this paper, we prove versions of each of these three conjectures for $\mathrm{GL}_3(K)$ when $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$ is unramified.

1.1. Breuil’s lattice conjecture. Motivated by Emerton’s local-global compatibility for completed cohomology, [CEG⁺] constructs a candidate for one direction of the p -adic local Langlands correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n(K)$. Namely, they associate to any continuous n -dimensional $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ -representation ρ of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$ an admissible Banach space representation $V(\rho)$ of $\mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ by patching completed cohomology. However, the construction depends on a choice of global setup, and one expects it to be a deep and difficult problem to show that the correspondence $\rho \mapsto V(\rho)$ is purely local.

In [Bre14], Breuil formulates a conjecture on lattices in tame types cut out by completed cohomology of Shimura curves which is closely related to the local nature of $V(\rho)$. This conjecture was proven subsequently in the ground-breaking work of Emerton–Gee–Savitt [EGS15]. Our first main theorem is a generalization of Breuil’s conjecture to three-dimensional Galois representations and the completed cohomology of $U(3)$ -arithmetic manifolds.

Specifically, let p be a prime, F/F^+ a CM extension (unramified everywhere), and $r : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$ a Galois representation. Let λ be the Hecke eigensystem corresponding to r , which appears in the cohomology of a $U(3)$ -arithmetic manifold. Choose a place $v|p$ of F^+ , and let $\tilde{H}$ be the integral v -adically completed cohomology. One expects completed cohomology to realize a global p -adic Langlands correspondence generalizing the case of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})$, that is, $\tilde{H}[\lambda]$ corresponds to $r|_{D_v}$ via a hypothetical p -adic local Langlands correspondence. In particular, the globally constructed object $\tilde{H}[\lambda]$ should depend only on $r|_{D_v}$.

Suppose that r is minimally ramified away from p and tamely potentially crystalline with Hodge–Tate weights $(0, 1, 2)$ at each place above p . Suppose that τ corresponds to the Weil–Deligne representations associated to $r|_{D_v}$ for all $v | p$ under the inertial local Langlands correspondence. If r is modular, then by classical local-global compatibility, $\tau \subset \tilde{H}[\lambda][1/p]$ with multiplicity one.

Theorem 1.1.1 (Breuil's conjecture, cf. Theorem 5.4.4). *Assume that p is unramified in F^+ , and that $\bar{r}$ satisfies Taylor–Wiles hypotheses, has split ramification, and is semisimple and sufficiently generic at places above p . Then, the lattice*

$$\tau^0 := \tau \cap \tilde{H}[\lambda] \subset \tau$$

depends only on the collection $\{r|_{D_v}\}_{v|p}$.

We also prove the following “mod p multiplicity one” result (cf. Theorem 5.4.1):

Theorem 1.1.2. *With hypotheses as in Theorem 1.1.1, let τ^σ be a lattice in τ such that the reduction $\bar{\tau}$ has a irreducible upper alcove cosocle, then $\mathrm{Hom}_{K_p}(\bar{\tau}, \overline{H}[\lambda])$ is one dimensional.*

These theorems should be compared to Theorem 8.2.1 and Theorem 10.2.1 in [EGS15] in dimension two. In the special case where p is split in F^+ and $\bar{r}$ is irreducible above p , both theorems were proven by the first author in [Le].

The main ingredients used in [EGS15] are the Taylor–Wiles patching method, the geometric Breuil–Mézard conjecture for potentially Barsotti–Tate Galois deformation rings (building on work of [Bre14]), and a classification of lattices in tame types (extending [Bre14, BP13]). When we began this project, only the first of these tools was available in the case of GL_3 . The analogue of potentially Barsotti–Tate Galois deformation is potentially crystalline deformation rings with Hodge–Tate weights $(2, 1, 0)$. In [LLHLM], we develop a technique for computing these Galois deformation rings with tame descent. We discuss in §1.2 the geometric Breuil–Mézard conjecture for these rings. The representation theoretic results are discussed in §1.3.

It is worth mentioning several key differences which distinguish our situation from [EGS15]. Breuil's conjecture for GL_2 gave an explicit description of the lattice τ^0 in terms of the Dieudonné module of $r|_{D_v}$. We prove abstractly that τ^0 is “purely local” but without giving any explicit description of the lattice. The lattice τ^0 is determined by the parameters of the Galois deformation ring but in a complicated way.

Let τ^σ be a lattice in τ whose reduction has irreducible cosocle σ . To prove Theorem 1.1.2, we show that a certain (minimal) patched module $M_\infty(\tau^\sigma)$ is free of rank one over the local Galois deformation ring (with patching variables) $R_\infty(\tau)$ (Theorem 5.2.1). In fact, this result is also a key step in our proof of Theorem 1.1.1. In *loc. cit.*, the analogue of this result is Theorem 10.1.1 where they show that the patched module of any lattice with irreducible cosocle is free of rank 1. In our situation, it is no longer true that all such patched modules are cyclic. Rather, this is only true when the cosocle σ is upper alcove in every embedding. As a consequence of this, one can

deduce that the isomorphism class as an $R_\infty(\tau)$ -module of $M_\infty(\tau^\sigma)$ is purely local for any lattice τ^σ , however, it need not be free.

For the proof that $M_\infty(\tau^\sigma)$ is free of rank one when σ is upper alcove, we induct on the complexity of the deformation ring. The simplest deformation rings resemble those for GL_2 and so we follow the strategy similar to [EGS15]. For the most complicated deformation rings, we build up $M_\infty(\tau^\sigma)$ from its subquotients relying on the description of the submodule structure of reduction $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ discussed in 1.3 and crucially intersection theory results for components of mod p fiber of the Galois deformation ring.

1.2. Serre weight and Breuil–Mézard conjectures. There is an analogous global context for a mod p Galois representation $\bar{\tau} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ whose corresponding Hecke eigensystem $\mathfrak{m}$ appears in the mod p v -adically completed cohomology of a $U(3)$ -arithmetic manifold. One expects $\bar{H}[\mathfrak{m}]$ to correspond to $\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}$ via a hypothetical mod p local Langlands correspondence. Furthermore, if we let $W_v(\bar{\tau})$ be the set of Jordan–Hölder factors in the $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathcal{O}_v)$ -socle of $\bar{H}[\mathfrak{m}]$ and $\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}$ is tamely ramified, [Her09, GHS] predict that $W_v(\bar{\tau}) = W^?(\bar{\tau}|_{I_v})$, for some set $W^?(\bar{\tau}|_{I_v})$ explicitly defined in terms of $\bar{\tau}|_{I_v}$.

We have the following version of the weight part of Serre’s conjecture (cf. Theorem 3.4.13):

Theorem 1.2.1 (The weight part of Serre’s conjecture). *Assume that p is unramified in F^+ , and that $\bar{\tau}$ satisfies Taylor–Wiles hypotheses, has split ramification, and is semisimple and sufficiently generic at places above p . Then $W_v(\bar{\tau}) = W^?(\bar{\tau}|_{I_v})$.*

In [LLHLM], we proved this theorem with the additional assumption that p is split in F^+ . The strategy is to show the numerical Breuil–Mézard conjecture for the simplest deformation rings (shape has length at least two) using [LLHLM, §6.2]. The key new tool is a more conceptual and robust combinatorial technique for computing the intersection between the predicted weights $W^?(\bar{\tau}|_{I_v})$ and the Jordan–Hölder factors of a type which is developed in §2. This allows us to inductively prove that all predicted weights are modular.

Using a patching functor which is constructed globally, we show that the generic fibers of tamely potentially crystalline deformation rings of Hodge–Tate weight $(0, 1, 2)$ are connected for $\bar{\rho}$ generic and deduce the full numerical Breuil–Mézard conjecture for these Galois deformation rings (all multiplicities for modular Serre weights are one). Using the numerical formulation, we prove the following geometric version of the Breuil–Mézard conjecture (cf. [EG14], Proposition 3.5.1).

Theorem 1.2.2. *There is a unique assignment $\sigma \mapsto \mathfrak{p}(\sigma)$ taking Serre weights $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\tau}|_{D_v})$ to prime ideals in the unrestricted deformation ring $R_{\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}}^\square$ such that the special fiber $\mathrm{Spec}(\bar{R}_{\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}}^{\tau, \square})$ of a*

generic tamely potentially crystalline deformation ring of Hodge–Tate weight $(0, 1, 2)$ is the reduced underlying subscheme of

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in W_v^?(\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}) \cap \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})} \text{Spec} (R_{\bar{\tau}|_{D_v}}^{\square} / \mathfrak{p}(\sigma)).$$

Moreover, this is compatible with any patching functor.

1.3. Representation theory results. In order to deduce Breuil's lattice conjecture from the Breuil–Mézard conjecture we need and prove new results on integral structures in Deligne–Lusztig representations, which may be of independent interest. The main theorem (Theorem 4.1.2) is a classification of integral lattices with irreducible cosocle in tame types, by means of an *extension graph*, which plays a key role in the proofs of Theorems 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.

We now briefly describe the extension graph. In §2.1 and Lemma 4.1.10, we introduce a graph on the set of regular Serre weights (with fixed central character), with vertices corresponding to regular Serre weights and adjacency between vertices described in a combinatorially explicit way. We then show that two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding Serre weights have a non-trivial $\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -extension between them, justifying the terminology. This gives a natural notion of *graph distance* d_{gph} between two regular Serre weights. Theorem 4.1.2 states the following.

Theorem 1.3.1. *The Jordan–Hölder factors of $\bar{\tau}$ occur with multiplicity one. Suppose that $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma') = d$. Then*

- (1) σ' is a direct summand of the d -th layer of the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$;
- (2) every extension that might occur between layers of the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ described in (1) does occur; and
- (3) if $\tau^{\sigma'} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma}$ is a saturated inclusion of lattices, then $p^d \tau^{\sigma} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma'}$ is also a saturated inclusion of lattices.

The argument is involved, using a mixture of local and global techniques, but we can distinguish two main steps in its proof. In the first step (§4.2), we prove the first two items of Theorem 1.3.1 in the case when σ is a lower alcove weight of defect zero (cf. Theorem 4.2.1). The proof uses methods from the modular representation theory of algebraic groups, embedding $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ in a Weyl module with non- p -restricted highest weights. The key local argument is a careful study of the restriction of algebraic representations to rational points (Proposition 4.2.5), letting us constrain the submodule structure of the relevant part of a Weyl module restricted to $\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$ in terms of the extension graph. This method does not work for all weights $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$, as the corresponding lattices will not always have simple socle, and thus can not be embedded into a Weyl module.

In the second step, we reduce the theorem for the remaining lattices to the case treated in the first step. We relate the first two items and the last item of Theorem 1.3.1. The last item, a statement in characteristic zero, is amenable to an inductive analysis. First, we show that for a fixed weight $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$, item (3) of Theorem 1.3.1 actually implies the other two items (cf. Proposition 4.3.10). This crucially uses Theorem 1.3.1(3) in the case $d = 1$ (cf. Proposition 4.3.3), which is proved using the computation of deformation rings in [LLHLM], combinatorics of §3, and the Kisin–Taylor–Wiles patching method. This argument follows the suggestion in [EGS15, §B.2] that tamely potentially crystalline deformation rings strongly reflect aspects of local representation theory through global patching constructions.

Next, we show that the first two items of Theorem 1.3.1 applied to τ and its dual in the case of lower alcove defect zero weights imply Theorem 1.3.1(3) in the case of lower alcove defect zero weights. From this starting point, an inductive argument proves Theorem 1.3.1(3), thus concluding the proof of Theorem 1.3.1.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Christophe Breuil, James Humphreys, and Cornelius Pillen for many helpful conversations. We would also like to thank Matthew Emerton, Toby Gee, and Florian Herzig for their support, guidance, and for comments on an earlier draft of this paper. We would like to thank the Institut Henri Poincaré for its hospitality during the final stages of the project.

1.4. Notation. If F is any field, we write $G_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{F}/F)$ for the absolute Galois group, where $\bar{F}$ is a separable closure of F . If F is moreover a p -adic field, we write I_F to denote the inertia subgroup of G_F .

We fix once and for all an algebraic closure $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ of $\mathbb{Q}$. All number fields are considered as subfield of our fixed $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Similarly, if $\ell \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a prime, we fix algebraic closures $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ as well as embeddings $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. All finite extensions of $\mathbb{Q}_\ell$ will this be considered as subfield in $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. Moreover, the residue field of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ is denoted by $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$.

Let $p > 3$ be a prime. For $f > 0$. K will be the unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ of degree f . We write k for its residue field and $\mathcal{O}_K$ for its ring of integers. We set $e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^f - 1$ and fix a root $\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-p)^{\frac{1}{e}} \in \bar{K}$. Define the extension $L = K(\pi)$ and set $\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(L/K)$. The choice of the root π let us define a character

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}_\pi : \Delta &\rightarrow W^\times \\ g &\mapsto \frac{g(\pi)}{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

whose associated residual character is denoted by ω_π . In particular, for $f = 1$, ω_π is the mod p cyclotomic character, which will be simply denoted by ω . If $F_w/\mathbb{Q}_p$ is a finite extension and $W_{F_w} \leq G_{F_w}$ denotes the Weil group we normalize Artin's reciprocity map $\text{Art}_{F_w} : F_w^\times \rightarrow W_{F_w}^{\text{ab}}$ in such a way that the geometric Frobenius elements are sent to uniformizers.

Let E be a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ (coefficient field). We write $\mathcal{O}$ for its ring of integers, fix an uniformizer $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}$ and let $\mathfrak{m}_E = (\varpi)$. We write $\mathbb{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}_E$ for its residue field. We will always assume that E is sufficiently large, i.e. that any embedding $\sigma : K \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ factors through $E \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. In particular, any embedding $\sigma : k \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ factors through $\mathbb{F}$.

Let $\rho : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(E)$ be a p -adic, de Rham Galois representation. For $\sigma : K \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, we define $\text{HT}_\sigma(\rho)$ to be the multiset of σ -labeled Hodge-Tate weights of ρ , i.e. the set of integers i such that $\dim_E(\rho \otimes_{\sigma, K} \mathbb{C}_p(-i))^{G_K} \neq 0$ (with the usual notation for Tate twists). In particular, the cyclotomic character has Hodge-Tate weight 1. We define the *Hodge type* of ρ to be the multiset $(\text{HT}_\sigma(\rho))_{\sigma : K \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ and the *inertial type* of ρ as the isomorphism class of $\text{WD}(\rho)|_{I_K}$, where $\text{WD}(\rho)$ is the Weil-Deligne representation attached to ρ as in [CDT99], Appendix B.1 (in particular, $\rho \mapsto \text{WD}(\rho)$ is *covariant*). Recall that an inertial type is a morphism $\tau : I_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(E)$ with open kernel and which extends to the Weil group W_K of G_K .

We now fix an embedding $\sigma_0 : K \subset E$. The embedding σ_0 induces maps $\mathcal{O}_K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}$ and $k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$; we will abuse notation and denote these all by σ_0 . We let φ denote the p -th power Frobenius on k and set $\sigma_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_0 \circ \varphi^{-i}$. The choice of embedding gives a fundamental character $\omega_f := \sigma_0 \circ \tilde{\omega}_\pi : I_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$ of niveau f .

It will often be convenient to work with the group obtained by Weil-restriction. Let $\underline{G} = \text{Res}_{\mathbb{F}_{p^f}/\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbf{GL}_3$ with $\underline{T}$ the diagonal torus and center $\underline{Z}$. Let $X^*(\underline{T}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^3)^f$ denote the character lattice. Under this isomorphism, $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} \mu_i^{(i)}$ goes to $(\mu_i)_i$, where μ_i corresponds to a character of the diagonal torus in $\mathbf{GL}_{3/\mathbb{F}_q}$ in the usual way, and $\mu_i^{(i)} = \mu_i \circ \varphi^i$. Let π denote the action of Frobenius on $X^*(\underline{T})$, e.g. if $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_i \in X^*(\underline{T})$, then $(\pi\lambda)_i = \lambda_{i-1}$. Choose the upper triangular matrices to be the positive Borel. Let $X_+^*(\underline{T})$ be the dominant weights with respect to upper triangular Borel, and let $X_1(\underline{T}) \subset X_+^*(\underline{T})$ be the subset of p -restricted weights. Let $\eta_i = (2, 1, 0) \in X^*(\mathbf{GL}_3)$, and $\eta = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} \eta_i^{(i)} \in X^*(\underline{T})$, a lift of the half sum of the positive roots.

Let $\underline{G}^{\text{der}}$ be $\text{Res}_{\mathbb{F}_{p^f}/\mathbb{F}_p} \text{SL}_3$ with torus $\underline{T}^{\text{der}}$. Let $\Lambda_W = X^*(\underline{T}^{\text{der}})$ denote the weight lattice for $\underline{G}^{\text{der}}$. Let $X^0(\mathbf{T})$ be the kernel of the restriction map $X^*(\underline{T}) \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_W$. Let $\Lambda_R \subset \Lambda_W$ be the root lattice. Let $\omega_{1,i}$ and $\omega_{2,i}$ be the usual dominant minuscule weights. We will often consider the weights $\omega_{1,i}$ and $\omega_{2,i}$ as the elements $(1, 0, 0)_i$ and $(0, 0, -1)_i$, respectively, of $X^*(\underline{T})$. By linearity, this defines a section $\Lambda_W \rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})$. We embed $\Lambda_R \subset X^*(\underline{T})$ so that its image in $X^*(\underline{Z})$ is trivial.

Let $\widetilde{W}_a$ (resp. $\widetilde{W}$) be the (extended) affine Weyl group for $\text{Res}_{\mathbb{F}_{p^f}/\mathbb{F}_p} \text{SL}_3$ (resp. $\underline{G}$) which is a semidirect product $\Lambda_R \rtimes W(\underline{G})$ (resp. $X^*(\underline{T}) \rtimes W(\underline{G})$) which acts in the usual way on Λ_W and $X^*(\underline{T})$ such that $(\lambda, s)(\mu) = s(\mu) + \lambda$ if $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ and $(\lambda, s) \in \widetilde{W}$. There is also a left action of $\widetilde{W}_a$ on $W(\underline{G})$ via projection. We extend the Frobenius action π to $\widetilde{W}$ such that $\pi(s)_j = s_{j-1}$ for $s \in W(\underline{G})$. For any $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$, we use $t_\lambda \in \widetilde{W}$ to denote translation by λ .

We fix the dominant base alcove $\mathbf{a}^+$ in the apartment for SL_3 to be the one with vertices given by $\mathbf{0}, \bar{\omega}_1, \bar{\omega}_2$. Let α, β, γ^+ denote the generators for the affine Weyl group $\widetilde{W}_{\text{SL}_3}$ of SL_3 given by reflection over the walls of $\mathbf{a}$ with $\alpha, \beta \in S_3$ and γ^+ is the affine reflection where α, β satisfy $\alpha(\bar{\omega}_2) = \omega_2$ and $\beta(\bar{\omega}_1) = \bar{\omega}_1$. We also have the extended affine Weyl group $\widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_3}$ of GL_3 .

Let S_3 denote the symmetric group on $\{1, 2, 3\}$. We fix an injection $S_3 \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{Z})$ by setting $s \mapsto M_s$, where M_s is defined by $(M_s)_{k,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_{k,s(m)}$ and $\delta_{k,s(m)} \in \{0, 1\}$ is the Kronecker δ specialized at $\{k, s(m)\}$. We also embed the group of cocharacters $X^*(\mathbf{T}) = \mathbb{Z}^3$ into $\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}((v)))$ via $\lambda \mapsto v^\lambda$ where then $v^{(a,b,c)}$ is the diagonal matrix with entries v^a, v^b, v^c respectively. In this way, we get an embedding of the extended affine Weyl group $X^*(\mathbf{T}) \rtimes S_3 = \widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_n} \subset \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}((v)))$.

2. EXTENSION GRAPH

In this section, we give a description of the extension graph of generic irreducible representations of the group $G = \mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_{p^f})$ and describe the constituents of the mod p reduction of generic tame types. This also gives a description of the set $W^?(\bar{\rho})$ of predicted Serre weights defined by Herzig [Her09]. In the next section, we use these descriptions to prove the Serre weight conjectures. The distance in the extension graph also plays an important role in computing the cosocle filtration for the reductions of lattices in tame types in subsection 4.3.

2.1. Definition and properties of the extension graph. For the weight space of SL_3 , we use the alcove labeling as in [Hum06], §13.9. In particular, A (resp. B) denotes the p -restricted lower (resp. upper) alcove of the weight space of SL_3 , so that $\mathcal{A} = \{A, B\}^f$ is naturally identified with the set of p -restricted alcoves for $\underline{G}^{\mathrm{der}}$. Our alcoves are fundamental domains with respect to the *dot action*, so the base alcove will have a vertex at $-\eta$. For notational convenience, we sometimes identify $\mathcal{A}$ with $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^f$ so that 0_i and 1_i correspond to the lowest and highest p -restricted alcoves, respectively, in the i -th factor of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $X_1(\underline{T})$ denote the set of p -restricted weights of $\underline{G}$ and $\underline{C}_0 \subseteq X_1(\underline{T})$ denote the set of lower alcove weights of $\underline{G}$. We consider $\widetilde{W}_p^{\mathrm{der}} = p\Lambda_W \rtimes W(\underline{G}) \subset \widetilde{W}^{\mathrm{der}}$ acting via the dot action on the apartment for $\underline{G}^{\mathrm{der}}$. Let $W_+ \subset \widetilde{W}_p^{\mathrm{der}}$ denote the set of elements which take the lowest dominant p -restricted alcove $\underline{A}$ to a dominant p -restricted alcove. If $f = 1$, there are six elements of W_+ , namely id , $(12)t_{-p(\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1})}$, $(23)t_{-p(\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1})}$, $(123)t_{-p\omega_2}$, $(132)t_{-p\omega_1}$, and $(13)t_{-p(\omega_1 + \omega_2)}$. Observe that the translation part and the Weyl group part of each element of W_+ uniquely determine each other. This immediately implies:

Lemma 2.1.1. *Let $(\nu, wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega}) \in \Lambda_R \times W^+$. For fixed ν , the datum of the element $w \in W(\underline{G})$ is equivalent to the datum of the element $\omega \in \Lambda_W$ which is equivalent to the datum of the pair $(\overline{\omega + \nu}, wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A})) \in \Lambda_W / \Lambda_R \times \mathcal{A}$.*

Lemma 2.1.2. *The map $\Lambda_R \times W_+ \rightarrow \Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A}$, defined by*

$$(\nu, wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega}) \mapsto (\omega + \nu, \pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}))$$

is a bijection.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1.1, given a pair $(\omega', a) \in \Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A}$, there exists a unique element $\tilde{w} = wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \in W_+$ such that $\tilde{w}(A) = \pi^{-1}(a)$, and $\omega \equiv \omega' \pmod{\Lambda_R}$. If $\nu \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \omega' - \omega$, $(\omega', a) \mapsto (\nu, \tilde{w})$ gives the inverse to the above map. $\square$

For a fixed character $\mu \in X_1(\underline{T})$, using Lemma 2.1.2 we define

$$\mathfrak{T}'_\mu : \Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})$$

by

$$\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(\omega + \nu, \pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A})) = wt_{\nu+\omega-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\mu + \underline{1} - \eta),$$

where $wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \in W_+$ and $\nu \in \Lambda_R$. Note that on the right hand side, ω is an element of $X^*(T)$ via our chosen section $\Lambda_W \rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})$, and we always regard Λ_R as the kernel of the restriction map $\Sigma : X^*(\underline{T}) \rightarrow X^*(\underline{Z})$. Changing the choice of the lift of ω to $X^*(\underline{T})$ changes the end result by an element of $(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T})$.

Define $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}$ to be the composition of $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'$ and the projection map $X^*(\underline{T}) \rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})/(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T})$. There is an action of $\widetilde{W}_a$ on $\Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A}$ where it acts on just the first factor (via the *usual* action, not the dot action).

Definition 2.1.3. We say that a weight $\lambda \in X^*(T)$ is *regular* if $0 \leq \langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle < p - 1$ for all simple roots $\alpha \in \Lambda_R$.

Define Λ_W^μ to be the set,

$$\{\omega \in \Lambda_W : \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(\omega, \underline{A}) \in \underline{C}_0/(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T}) \text{ and is regular}\}$$

(note that the second condition follows from the first, since our alcoves are open). We establish some basic properties of $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu$:

Proposition 2.1.4.

- (1) Λ_W^μ is the set of $\omega' \in \Lambda_W$ such that the projection to Λ_W of $\omega' + \mu - \eta$ is in the lowest alcove $\underline{A}$.
- (2) For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\omega' \in \Lambda_W^\mu$, the image of $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'(\omega', a)$ in Λ_W is regular, $\widetilde{W}_p^{\text{der}}$ -linked to $\omega' + \mu - \eta$ and is in alcove $\pi^{-1}(a)$.
- (3) $(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}(\omega', a) - \mu - \underline{1} + \eta)|_{\underline{Z}} \in (p - \pi)X^*(\underline{Z})$.

Proof. We write $\omega' = \omega + \nu$ with $\nu \in \Lambda_R$ and ω uniquely determined by $\pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}) = \underline{A}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(\omega', \underline{A}) = wt_{\omega+\nu-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\mu + \underline{1} - \eta) = wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\mu + \omega' + \underline{1} - \eta)$$

Since $wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}) = \underline{A}$, this gives the first item. The same computation with a replacing $\underline{A}$ on the right-hand side shows the second item.

For the third item, we simply observe that $\Sigma \circ w = \Sigma$, and $\Sigma(\Lambda_R) = 0$.

□

From now on we restrict $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu$ to $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 2.1.5. *The map $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu$ is injective.*

Proof. Suppose (ω'_1, a_1) and (ω'_2, a_2) have the same image under $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}$. We have decompositions $\omega'_i = \omega_i + \nu_i$ and elements $w_i t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega_i}$ which sends $\underline{A}$ to a_i as in the proof of Proposition 2.1.4. By the second item of this proposition (and regularity of the weights involved), we must have $a_1 = a_2 = a$. Now restricting to $\underline{Z}$ we have

$$\Sigma(\omega_1 - \omega_2 - p\pi^{-1}(\omega_1 - \omega_2)) \in \Sigma((p - \pi)X^0(T)) \subset 3(p - \pi)X^*(\underline{Z})$$

It follows that there exists $v \in X^*(\underline{Z})$ such that $(p - \pi)(\Sigma(\omega_1 - \omega_2) - 3v) = 0$. Since $p - \pi$ has trivial kernel on $X^*(\underline{Z})$, it follows that $\Sigma(\omega_1 - \omega_2) \in 3X^*(\underline{Z})$. However, the class of $\Sigma(\omega_i)$ in $3X^*(\underline{Z})$ uniquely determines ω_i , which together with the alcove $w_i t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega_i}(\underline{A})$ uniquely determines w_i by Lemma 2.1.1. So we conclude that $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $w_1 = w_2$, and hence $\omega_1 + \nu_1 + \mu - \eta = \omega_2 + \nu_2 + \mu - \eta$, so $\omega'_1 = \omega'_2$. $\square$

Proposition 2.1.6. *The image of $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu$ is precisely the set of regular weights $\lambda \in X_1(\underline{T})$ modulo $(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T})$ such that the restriction $(\lambda - \mu - \underline{1} + \eta)|_{\underline{Z}}$ is in $(p - \pi)X^*(\underline{Z})$.*

Proof. Let a denote the unique alcove that contains $\pi\lambda$. The set of ω such that $\pi w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}) = a$ with $w \in W(\underline{G})$ form a complete set of representatives for Λ_W/Λ_R by Lemma 2.1.1. Let $\Sigma(\lambda - \mu - \underline{1} + \eta) = (p - \pi)v$. Since $\Sigma : \Lambda_W \rightarrow X^*(\underline{Z})/3X^*(\underline{Z})$ (where the map comes from our choice of section $\Lambda_W \rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})$) is surjective, and $\Sigma(X^0(\underline{T})) = 3X^*(\underline{Z})$, we can find ω as above and $x \in X^0(\underline{T})$ such that $\Sigma(\omega - p\pi^{-1}\omega - (p - \pi)x) = (p - \pi)v$. Hence there exists $\nu \in \Lambda_R$ such that $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(\nu + \omega, \underline{A}) = w t_{\nu + \omega - p\pi^{-1}\nu} \cdot (\mu + \underline{1} - \eta) = \lambda$. These choices give $\nu = \lambda - (1 - p\pi^{-1})\omega - \mu - \underline{1} + \eta - (p - \pi)x \in \text{Ker}(\Sigma) = \Lambda_R$. This gives $\lambda - \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}(\omega + \nu, a) \in (p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T})$ and we are done. $\square$

Proposition 2.1.7. *If $\lambda + \underline{1} - \eta = \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(\omega', \underline{A})$ and $w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega}(\underline{A}) = \underline{A}$ with $\omega \equiv \omega' \pmod{\Lambda_R}$, then*

$$\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\lambda(\omega'', a) = \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(w^{-1}(\omega'') + \omega', a).$$

Proof. Consider the decompositions $\omega' = \omega + \nu$, $\omega'' = \tau_1 + \nu_1$ with $\nu, \nu_1 \in \Lambda_R$ and $\pi w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} \cdot (\underline{A}) = a$. Thus $\pi w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}) = a$ and $w^{-1}(\omega'') + \omega' = \tau_1 + \omega \pmod{\Lambda_R}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda + \underline{1} - \eta &= \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(\omega', \underline{A}) = w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\omega' + \mu + \underline{1} - \eta) \\ \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\lambda(\omega'', a) &= w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} \cdot (\omega'' + \lambda + \underline{1} - \eta) = w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\mu + \omega' + \underline{1} - \eta) + w_1 \omega'' \\ \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}'_\mu(w^{-1}(\omega'') + \omega', a) &= w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (w^{-1}(\omega'') + \omega' + \mu + \underline{1} - \eta) \\ &= w_1 \omega'' + w_1 t_{-p\pi^{-1}\tau_1} w t_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\mu + \omega' + \underline{1} - \eta) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

For convenience we record in Table 1 the embeddingwise relations between the elements $\pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A})$ and the translates $wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot \mu$:

TABLE 1. **Principal parts of the translation map $\mathfrak{Tr}_{\mu+\eta-\underline{1}}$ centered in $\mu + \eta - \underline{1}$**

ω_{i+1}	0	$\omega_1 + \omega_2$	ω_2	$\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1}$	ω_1	$\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1}$
w_i	()	(13)	(123)	(12)	(132)	(23)
$(\overline{\omega}_{i+1}, (\pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}))_i)$	(0, A)	(0, B)	$(\overline{\omega}_2, A)$	$(\overline{\omega}_2, B)$	$(\overline{\omega}_1, A)$	$(\overline{\omega}_1, B)$
$w_i t_{-p\omega_{i+1}}$	μ_i	$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}\mu_i$	$(123)t_{-p\omega_2} \cdot \mu_i$	$(12)t_{-p(\omega_1-\omega_2-\underline{1})} \cdot \mu_i$	$(132)t_{-p\omega_1} \cdot \mu_i$	$(23)t_{-p(\omega_2-\omega_1+\underline{1})} \cdot \mu_i$

If $(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A}$, we write $F(\mathfrak{Tr}_\mu(\omega, a))$ to denote the isomorphism class of the G-representation $F(\lambda)$ where $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ is any lift of $\mathfrak{Tr}_\mu((\omega, a))$. Note that $F(\mathfrak{Tr}_\mu(\omega, a))$ is independent of the choice of λ . We have shown that $F(\mathfrak{Tr}(-))$ induces a bijection between the set $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ and the set of regular Serre weights of G with fixed central character.

Definition 2.1.8. We say that (ω, a) and (ω', a') in $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ are *adjacent* if there exist $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ such that $a - a' = (\delta_{ij})$ and $\omega_i = \omega'_i$ for all $i \neq j$ and, for $i = j$, $\omega_j - \omega'_j \in \{0, \pm(\omega_{1,j} - \omega_{2,j}), \pm\omega_{1,j}, \pm\omega_{2,j}\}$.

Geometrically, Λ_W^μ is the intersection of Λ_W with a translate of a p -alcove, and two pairs (ω_1, a_1) and (ω_2, a_2) are adjacent if and only if ω_1 and ω_2 are neighbors (or equal) in Λ_W and a_1 and a_2 have opposite labels in exactly the component where ω_1 and ω_2 differ. Note that for any $(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W^\mu$ in the interior, there are 7^f adjacent vertices. Definition 2.1.8 endows $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ with a graph structure with edges given by adjacency. By Proposition 2.1.6, this graph is connected, and thus induces a distance function on the set of regular Serre weights (weights with different central character by convention have distance ∞). Proposition 2.1.7 shows that distance is independent of the choice of μ . Given regular weights $\mu, \lambda \in X_1(T)$, we write $d_{\text{gph}}(F(\mu), F(\lambda))$ to denote their distance. We say that $F(\mu)$ and $F(\lambda)$ are *adjacent* if $d_{\text{gph}}(F(\mu), F(\lambda)) = 1$.

We wish to describe how the constituents of the mod p reduction of a tame K -types appear in the graph. We follow the notation of [Her09, §4.1] for types. We recall the definition of depth for a weight:

Definition 2.1.9. Let $\lambda \in X^*(\mathbf{T})$ be a dominant weight. We say that λ lies n -deep in its alcove if there exists integers $m_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in R^+$ such that $pm_\alpha + n < \langle \lambda + \eta, \alpha \rangle < p(m_\alpha + 1) - n$ for all positive roots $\alpha \in R^+$. We have the analogous definition of n -deepness for weights in $X^*(\underline{T})$ via the product structure.

For instance, a dominant weight $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_i \in X^*(\underline{T})$ lies n -deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$ if $n < \langle \lambda_i + \eta_i, \alpha_i \rangle < p - n$ for all $i = 0, \dots, f-1$ and all positive roots $\alpha_i \in R^+$.

As for types, we have the following:

Definition 2.1.10. Let τ be a tame K -type. We say that τ is n -generic if there is an isomorphism $\tau \cong R_s(\lambda + \eta)$ for some $s \in W(\underline{G})$ and $\lambda \in X_+^*(\underline{T})$ which is n -deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$.

Remark 2.1.11. The results of [LLHLM] apply for all 3-generic types (the condition in *loc. cit.* is slightly weaker). Our notion of genericity differs from that of [GHS] (Definition 10.1.11) via a shift by η . This notion seemed easier to work with and behaves well in the triangle picture introduced in the §2.2 below.

The graph on $X_1(\underline{T})$ defined by adjacency is the extension graph.

Theorem 2.1.12. Let $\lambda, \lambda' \in X_1(\underline{T})$ be 8-generic. Then $\text{Ext}_{\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}^1(F(\lambda), F(\lambda')) \neq 0$ if and only if $F(\lambda)$ and $F(\lambda')$ are adjacent.

Proof. This is Lemma 4.1.10, the proof is entirely modular representation theory and doesn't use any results from other sections. $\square$

2.2. Combinatorics of types and Serre weights. We first describe the obvious Serre weights of a semisimple $\bar{\rho}$ in terms of the graph. We follow the notation of §6 of [Her09]. If $\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}$ is semisimple, then recall the K -type $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v})$ as defined in [Her09], §6.4. Explicitly, we have the following by Proposition 6.14 in *loc. cit.*:

Example 2.2.1. For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ let $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq p^f - 2$ and write $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in X^*(\mathbf{T})$. If

$$\bar{\rho}|_{I_v} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \omega_f^{\lambda_1} & & \\ & \omega_f^{\lambda_2} & \\ & & \omega_f^{\lambda_3} \end{pmatrix},$$

then $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}) = R_1(\lambda)$. If

$$\bar{\rho}|_{I_v} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{2f}^{\lambda_1 + p^f \lambda_2} & & \\ & \omega_{2f}^{\lambda_2 + p^f \lambda_1} & \\ & & \omega_f^{\lambda_3} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, then $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}) = R_{(12)}(\lambda)$. If

$$\bar{\rho}|_{I_v} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{3f}^{\lambda_1 + p^f \lambda_2 + p^{2f} \lambda_3} & & \\ & \omega_{3f}^{\lambda_2 + p^f \lambda_3 + p^{2f} \lambda_1} & \\ & & \omega_{3f}^{\lambda_3 + p^f \lambda_1 + p^{2f} \lambda_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the λ_i are not all equal, then $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}) = R_{(123)}(\lambda)$.

Definition 2.2.2. The set of predicted (local) weights for $\bar{\rho}$ semisimple is defined to be

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}) := \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{JH}(V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_K})))$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ is the bijection on regular Serre weights defined in [GHS], Definition 9.2.4. For any tame K -type τ , we furthermore define

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau) := W^?(\bar{\rho}) \cap \mathrm{JH}(\bar{\tau}).$$

Proposition 2.2.3. *Suppose that $V(\bar{\rho}|_I) = R_s(\lambda)$ with $\lambda - \eta$ 2-deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$. Then $W_{\mathrm{obv}}(\bar{\rho})$ is the set*

$$\{F(wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega + s\omega}(\lambda) - \eta) : wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \in W_+\}.$$

Proof. By [GHS, Proposition 9.4.7], $F(\lambda' - \eta) \in W_{\mathrm{obv}}(\bar{\rho})$ if and only if $R_{s'}(\lambda') \cong R_s(\lambda)$ for some $s' \in W$. By [Her09, Section 4.1], this holds if and only if $\lambda' = w(\lambda) - wp\pi^{-1}(\omega) + ws(\omega)$ for some $w \in W$ and $\omega \in X^*(T)$. The condition on $wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega}$ is to guarantee that λ' is p -restricted. $\square$

The predicted weights $W^?(\bar{\rho})$ and the Jordan–Hölder factors of a generic tame K -type will appear as the image of a product of length two “triangles” inside $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ in a way in which we now make precise. We define an involution r of $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ by $r(\omega, a) = (\omega, a')$ with $a_i \neq a'_i$ for all i . We will write r_i for the action on the i -th factor of $\Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 2.2.4. Define

$$\Sigma_0 := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\omega_1 + \omega_2, 0), (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), (\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0) \\ (0, 1), (\omega_1, 1), (\omega_2, 1) \\ (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0), (\omega_2, 0) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Define $\Sigma \subset \Lambda_W \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^f$ to be f -tuples $((\omega_i, a_i))$ with $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0$.

Definition 2.2.5. Define the following subsets of Σ_0

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0^{\mathrm{obv}} &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\omega_1 + \omega_2, 0), (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), (\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0) \\ (0, 1), (\omega_1, 1), (\omega_2, 1) \end{array} \right\} \\ \Sigma_0^{\mathrm{inn}} &:= \Sigma_0 \setminus \Sigma_0^{\mathrm{obv}} \end{aligned}$$

We say that $(\omega, a) \in \Sigma$ is *obvious* (resp. *inner*) in embedding i if $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\mathrm{obv}}$ (resp. $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\mathrm{inn}}$).

Proposition 2.2.6. *Suppose that $V(\bar{\rho}|_I) = R_s(\mu + \underline{1} + \nu)$ where $\nu \in \Lambda_R$ and $\mu + \nu - \eta$ is 2-deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$. Then $W^?(\bar{\rho})$ is $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(t_\nu sr(\Sigma)))$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2.3, $W_{\text{obv}}(\bar{\rho})$ is given by

$$\{F(wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega+s\omega} \cdot (\mu + \underline{1} + \nu - \eta)) : wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \in W_+\}.$$

Now

$$wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega+s\omega} \cdot (\mu + \underline{1} + \nu - \eta) = \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(s\omega + \nu, \pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A})).$$

So $W^?(\bar{\rho})$ is

$$F(\{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(t_\nu s(\omega), a) | wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \in W_+, \pi wt_{-p\pi^{-1}\omega} \cdot (\underline{A}) \uparrow a\}).$$

This set is precisely $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(t_\nu sr(\Sigma)))$. $\square$

Proposition 2.2.7. *If $\nu \in \Lambda_R$ and $\mu + \nu - \eta$ is 2-deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$, then the set of Jordan–Hölder factors of $R_s(\mu + \nu)$ is $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(t_\nu s(\Sigma)))$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 2.2.6 and the fact that $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(\omega, a)) \in \text{JH}(R_s(\lambda))$ if and only if $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(r(\omega, a))) \in \mathcal{R}(\text{JH}(R_s(\lambda + \underline{1}))) = W^?(\bar{\rho})$ where $V(\bar{\rho}|_I) = R_s(\lambda + \underline{1})$, and $t_{\underline{1}} \circ \mathcal{R} \circ \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu = \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r} \circ r$. $\square$

Definition 2.2.8. For any $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$, we set $R_{\tilde{w}}(\mu) := R_w(\mu + \tilde{w}(\underline{0}))$, where $w \in W(\underline{G})$ is the projection of $\tilde{w}$.

Then by Propositions 2.2.6 and 2.2.7, we have the following:

Proposition 2.2.9. *The set of Jordan–Hölder factors of $R_{\tilde{w}}(\mu)$ is $F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(\tilde{w}(\Sigma)))$. If $V(\bar{\rho}|_I) = R_{\tilde{w}}(\mu + \underline{1})$, then $W^?(\bar{\rho}) = F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(\tilde{w}(r(\Sigma))))$.*

For the rest of this section, fix a character μ such that $\mu - \eta$ is 2-deep in $\underline{C}_0$ and an element $s \in W(\underline{G})$.

For $(s\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$, we let $\sigma_{(\omega, a)} = F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_\mu(s\omega, a))$ (note that we omit μ and s from the notation). Let $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_a$ such that $s\tilde{w}(\Sigma) \subset \Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$. Then the map

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(\Sigma) &\rightarrow \text{JH}(R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu)) \\ (\tilde{w}(\omega), a) &\rightarrow \sigma_{(\tilde{w}(\omega), a)} \end{aligned}$$

is a bijection by Proposition 2.2.9. Similarly, if $V(\bar{\rho}) = R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu + \underline{1})$, then the map

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(r(\Sigma)) &\rightarrow W^?(\bar{\rho}) \\ r(\tilde{w}(\omega), a) &\rightarrow \sigma_{r(\tilde{w}(\omega), a)} \end{aligned}$$


is a bijection by Proposition 2.2.9.

Definition 2.2.10. We say that $\sigma \in \text{JH}(R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu))$ is an *obvious* (resp. *inner*) weight for $R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu)$ in embedding i if $\sigma = \sigma_{(\tilde{w}(\omega), a)}$ with $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$ (resp. $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{inn}}$). We define the *defect* of σ as

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Def}(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\{i \in \mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } \sigma \text{ is inner in embedding } i\}.$$

Similarly, if $V(\bar{\rho}) = R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu + \underline{1})$, we say that $\sigma \in W^2(\bar{\rho})$ is an *obvious* (resp. *inner* or *shadow*) weight for $\bar{\rho}$ in embedding i if $\sigma = \sigma_{r(\tilde{w}(\omega), a)}$ with $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$ (resp. $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{inn}}$).

With this notation (and $\tilde{w} = \text{id}$), the induced graph on $\text{JH}(R_s(\mu))$ is the product graph of Table 2 on Σ_0 :

 TABLE 2. Induced graph on $R_s(\mu)$

 TABLE 3. Translations on $R_1(\mu + \eta - \underline{1})$ for $f = 1$

$(\omega + \nu, \pi w t - p\omega(\underline{A}))$	$(0, A)$	$(0, B)$	(ω_1, A)	(ω_1, B)	(ω_2, A)	(ω_2, B)	$(\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1}, A)$	$(\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1}, A)$	$(\omega_1 + \omega_2, A)$
(w, ω, ν)	$((\underline{0}, \underline{0}))$	$((13), \eta - \underline{1}, -\eta + \underline{1})$	$((132), \omega_1, \underline{0})$	$((23), \omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1}, 2\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1})$	$((123), \omega_2, \underline{0})$	$((12), \omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1}, 2\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1})$	$((123), \omega_2, -(2\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1}))$	$((132), \omega_1, -(2\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1}))$	$((\underline{0}, \underline{0}, \eta - \underline{1}))$
$\mathfrak{T}_{\mu+\eta-\underline{1}}(\omega + \nu, \pi w t - p\omega(\underline{A}))$	μ	$(13)t - p(\omega_1 + \omega_2) \cdot \mu$	$t - \omega_2 \cdot (132)t - p\omega_1 \cdot \mu$	$t_{\omega_1} \cdot (23)t - p(\omega_2 - \omega_1 + \underline{1}) \cdot \mu$	$t - \omega_1 \cdot (123)t - p\omega_2 \cdot \mu$	$t_{\omega_2} \cdot (12)t - p(\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \underline{1}) \cdot \mu$	$t_{\omega_2} \cdot (123)t - p\omega_2 \cdot \mu$	$t_{\omega_1} \cdot (132)t - p\omega_1 \cdot \mu$	$\lambda_A^{(0)} + \omega_G$

The relations between the translations $\mathfrak{T}_{\mu+\eta-\underline{1}}(\omega, a)$ and the weights appearing in $R_1(\mu + \eta - \underline{1})$ for $f = 1$.

We now describe the intersections between the Jordan–Hölder factors of $R_s(\mu)$ and $W^2(\bar{\rho})$ for different semisimple representations using the action of $\widetilde{W}_a$ on Λ_W using Proposition 2.2.9. We first introduce a subset of $\widetilde{W}_a$, the admissible set, which appears in Corollary 2.2.13 and will appear again in 3.

For any choice of base alcove for the apartment, we can endow $\widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_n}$ with a Bruhat order. For any weight $\nu \in X_*(T)$, recall that

$$\text{Adm}^\pm(\nu) = \{\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_n} \mid \tilde{w} \leq t_{s(\nu)} \text{ for some } s \in S_3\}$$

where $+$ (resp. $-$) indicates the choice of dominant (resp. anti-dominant) base alcove.

Definition 2.2.11. For any weight $\lambda = (\lambda_j)_j \in X_*(\underline{T})$, define

$$\mathrm{Adm}^\pm(\lambda) = \prod_j \mathrm{Adm}^\pm(\lambda_j) \subset \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{GL}_n}^f$$

Remark 2.2.12. As in [LLHLM], we will mostly be interested in $\mathrm{Adm}^\pm((2, 1, 0)^f)$. Note that in *loc. cit.* the generators we gave for affine Weyl group $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{SL}_3}$ were for the anti-dominant base alcove. Any element of $\mathrm{Adm}^-((2, 1, 0))$ is of the form $\tilde{w}_a t_{\underline{1}}$ where $\tilde{w}_a \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{SL}_3}$ so as in *loc. cit.*, we implicitly identify elements of $\mathrm{Adm}^\pm((2, 1, 0)^f)$ with the corresponding elements of $\widetilde{W}_a = \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{SL}_3}^f$. We use $\gamma^+ \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{SL}_3}$ to denote that affine reflection for the dominant base alcove.

Corollary 2.2.13. Let $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_0, \dots, \tilde{w}_{f-1}) \in \widetilde{W}_a$. Assume that $\mu + \tilde{w}(0) - \eta$ is 2-deep. Then $\mathrm{JH}(R_s(\mu)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{JH}(R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu + \underline{1})))$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{JH}(R_s(\mu + \underline{1}))) \cap \mathrm{JH}(R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu))$) is the set of weights $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ (resp. $\sigma_{r(\omega, a)}$) where $(\omega_j, a_j) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$ and $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$ is given in Table 4 ($\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j} = \emptyset$ if $\tilde{w}_j$ is not in $\mathrm{Adm}^+(2, 1, 0)$).

Proof. By Proposition 2.2.9, one can reduce the case where $s = \mathrm{id}$. In that case, using the description of the Jordan–Hölder factors in terms of $\mathfrak{T}_{\mu}$ above (which applies by our depth assumption), we are reduced to finding intersections of a triangle centered at $\tilde{w}$ and the triangle centered at id in Figure 1 (and also keeping track of the alcove label of each lattice point in each triangle). $\square$

Lemma 2.2.14. If $(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W \times \mathcal{A} \setminus r(\Sigma)$, there exists $\tilde{w} \notin \mathrm{Adm}^+(2, 1, 0)$ such that $(\omega, a) \in \tilde{w}(\Sigma)$.

Proof. We can work one embedding at a time, and thus reduce to the case $f = 1$. This can then be checked directly using Figure 1. $\square$

Corollary 2.2.15. Let λ be 4-deep. If $F(\lambda) \notin \mathcal{R}(R_s(\mu + \underline{1}))$, then there exists a type $R_{s'}(\mu')$ such that $F(\lambda) \in \mathrm{JH}(R_{s'}(\mu'))$ but

$$\mathcal{R}(R_s(\mu)) \cap \mathrm{JH}(R_{s'}(\mu')) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. If the central characters do not match, i.e., $(\lambda - \mu + \underline{1})|_{\underline{Z}} \notin (p - \pi)X^*(\underline{Z})$, then any Deligne–Lusztig representation which contains $F(\lambda)$ works. Otherwise, by Proposition 2.1.6, there exists $(s\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$ such that $\sigma_{(\omega, a)} \cong F(\lambda)$. Moreover, since $F(\lambda) \notin \mathcal{R}(R_s(\mu + \underline{1}))$, $(\omega, a) \notin r(\Sigma)$. By Lemma 2.2.14, there exists $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_a \setminus \mathrm{Adm}^+(2, 1, 0)$ such that $(\omega, a) \in \tilde{w}(\Sigma)$. We take $s' = s\tilde{w}$ and $\mu' = \mu + s\tilde{w}(0)$. Since λ is 4-deep, $s\tilde{w}(\Sigma)$ lies entirely in Λ_W^μ , and so by Proposition 2.2.7, $F(\lambda) \in \mathrm{JH}(R_{s'}(\mu'))$. By Corollary 2.2.13, $\mathcal{R}(R_s(\mu)) \cap \mathrm{JH}(R_{s'}(\mu')) = \emptyset$. $\square$

TABLE 4. Intersections

$\tilde{w}$	$\Sigma_{\tilde{w}}$	$\tilde{w}$	$\Sigma_{\tilde{w}}$
$\gamma^+ \alpha \beta \alpha = t_{(1,0,-1)}$	$\{(\omega_1 + \omega_2, 0)\}$	$\alpha \beta \alpha \gamma^+ = t_{(-1,0,1)}$	$\{(0, 1)\}$
$\beta \gamma^+ \beta \alpha = t_{(1,-1,0)}$	$\{(\omega_1, 1)\}$	$\beta \gamma \alpha \gamma^+ = t_{(0,-1,1)}$	$\{(\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0)\}$
$\alpha \gamma^+ \alpha \beta = t_{(0,1,-1)}$	$\{(\omega_2, 1)\}$	$\alpha \beta \gamma^+ \beta = t_{(-1,1,0)}$	$\{(\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0)\}$
$\beta \alpha \gamma^+$	$\{(\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), (\underline{0}, 1)\}$	$\alpha \beta \gamma^+$	$\{(\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0), (0, 1)\}$
$\alpha \beta \alpha$	$\{(\underline{0}, 1), (\underline{0}, 0)\}$		
$\alpha \beta$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} (\underline{0}, 1), & (\underline{0}, 0) \\ (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), & (\omega_1, 1) \end{array} \right\}$	$\beta \alpha$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} (\underline{0}, 1), & (\underline{0}, 0) \\ (\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0), & (\omega_2, 1) \end{array} \right\}$
α	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (\underline{0}, 1), & (\underline{0}, 0), & (\omega_2, 1) \\ (\omega_2, 0), & (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), & (\omega_1, 1) \end{array} \right\}$	Id	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (\underline{0}, 1) & (\omega_1, 1) & (\omega_2, 1) \\ (\underline{0}, 0) & (\omega_1, 0) & (\omega_2, 0) \end{array} \right\}$

TABLE 5. Not all elements in $\text{Adm}^+((2, 1, 0))$ appear in the table. There is an order three symmetry of $\text{Adm}^+((2, 1, 0))$ induced by the outer automorphism of $\widetilde{W}_{\text{SL}_3}$, and we include at least one representative for each orbit. The remaining subsets $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}}$ are easily determined using the rotational symmetry of Σ_0 .




FIGURE 1. The standard apartment of SL_3 . Labelled alcoves are alcoves in $\text{Adm}^+((2, 1, 0))$.

3. SERRE WEIGHT CONJECTURES

3.1. Étale φ -modules with descent data. In this section we recall, and improve, some results of [LLHLM] on étale φ -modules with descent data. We follow closely §2.1 and 2.3 (in the case of principal series types) and §6 (in the case of Kisin modules with tame descent data of higher niveau) of [LLHLM].

The main result of this subsection is Proposition 3.1.2, describing the Frobenius action on étale φ -modules with arbitrary tame descent data.

Let $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and write K' for the unramified extension of K of degree $f' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} fr$. As in §6.1 of [LLHLM], we consider the totally tamely ramified extension L'/K' of degree $p^{f'} - 1$ and fix a fundamental character $\omega_{f'} : I_{K'} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$ satisfying $\omega_{f'}^{\frac{e'}{f'}} = \omega_f$.

Let $\tau : I_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathcal{O})$ be a tame inertial type split over K' . We write $\tau = \eta_1 \oplus \eta_2 \oplus \eta_3$ for some tame characters $\eta_k : I_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathcal{O})$ and say that τ is a *principal series type* if $K = K'$. We write τ' for the base change of τ to K'/K (which is just τ considered as a principal series type for $G_{K'}$). Following §6.1 [LLHLM], there exist $\mu = (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3)$ with $\mathbf{a}_k = (a_{k,j})_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}^f$ and $s_\tau \in S_3$ of order r such that

$$\tau \cong \tau(s_\tau, -\mu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \omega_{f'}^{-\sum_{0 \leq k \leq r-1} \mathbf{a}_{s_\tau^k(i)}^{(0)} p^{fk}}$$

We will always assume that τ is 0-generic in the sense of Definition 2.1.10.

Let $\Delta' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(L'/K')$ and $\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(L'/K)$. For any $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra R , we define, following Definition 6.3 in *loc. cit.*, a category $Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R)$ of Kisin modules with height in $[0, 2]$ and type τ . An object of $Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R)$ is a pair $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota)$ where $\mathfrak{M}$ is a Kisin module $\mathfrak{M}$ over K' , with height in $[0, 2]$ and a semilinear action of Δ' of type τ' , together with an isomorphism $\iota : (\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{M}$ where $(\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M})$ denotes the *Frobenius twist* of $\mathfrak{M}$ (cf. §6.1 of [LLHLM]). In particular, we have a *base change* functor on Kisin modules $\text{BC} : Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R) \rightarrow Y^{[0,2],\tau'}(R)$ induced by the forgetful functor. If $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \in Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R)$, it is customary to write $\mathfrak{M}' \in Y^{[0,2],\tau'}(R)$ to denote its image via the base change functor.

Associated to $\mu = (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3)$, we have an *orientation* $s = (s_j)_j \in W(\underline{G})$ ([LLHLM], Definition 2.6). Letting $s^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (s_{f-1}^{-1}, s_{f-2}^{-1}, \dots, s_1^{-1}, s_0^{-1})$ (see Definition 3.3.2), we see that $s^*(\mu) - \eta$ is in alcove $\underline{C}_0$. For convenience, we define

$$(3.1) \quad s_{\tau,\mu} := (\pi^{-1}s)^{-1}(1, 1, \dots, s_\tau^{-1})s \in W(\underline{G}).$$

Definition 3.1.1. An *eigenbasis* of $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \in Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R)$ is an eigenbasis $\beta' = (\beta'^{(j')})_{j'}$ for $\mathfrak{M}'$ in the sense of [LLHLM], Definition 2.8, which is compatible with the isomorphism ι : by letting

$\beta^{(j')} = (f_1^{(j')}, f_2^{(j')}, f_3^{(j')})$ then

$$\mathfrak{M}^{(j')} \xleftarrow{\sim} ((\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}))^{j'+f} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathfrak{M}^{(j'+f)}$$

$$\{f_1^{(j')}, f_2^{(j')}, f_3^{(j')}\} \mapsto \{f_1^{(j'+f)}, f_2^{(j'+f)}, f_3^{(j'+f)}\}$$

for all $0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1$. For short, the compatibility above will be written as $\iota(\beta^{(j')}) = \beta^{(j'+f)}$.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, K'}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'}$) be the p -adic completion of $(W(k')[[v]])[1/v]$ (resp. of $(W(k')[[u]])[1/u]$). Recall from [LLHLM], §2.3 the category $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{K'}^{\text{ét}}$ (resp. $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{dd, L'}^{\text{ét}}$) of étale $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, K'} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R)$ -modules (resp. étale $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R)$ -modules with descent data from L' to K'). There is an analogous definition of $\Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}$ and $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{dd, L}^{\text{ét}}$. Given $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \in Y^{[0, 2], \tau}(R)$, the element $\mathfrak{M}' \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'}$ is naturally an object $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{dd, L'}^{\text{ét}}(R)$ and we write $\mathcal{M}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathfrak{M} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'})^{\Delta=1}$, which is an element in $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{K'}^{\text{ét}}(R)$. By defining a “Frobenius twist” on $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{K'}^{\text{ét}}$ in the evident way, it follows easily from [LLHLM] Lemma 6.2 that $\mathcal{M}'$ is endowed with an isomorphism $\iota : (\sigma^f)^*(\mathcal{M}') \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}')$ inducing isomorphisms $\iota : \mathcal{M}'^{(j')} \xleftarrow{\sim} ((\sigma^f)^*(\mathcal{M}'))^{(j'+f)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}'^{(j'+f)}$ for all $0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1$, which are moreover compatible with the partial Frobenii on $\mathcal{M}'^{(j')}$ and $\mathcal{M}'^{(j'+f)}$.

We can further define an étale φ -module $\mathcal{M} \in \Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R)$ by

$$\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathfrak{M} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'})^{\Delta=1} = (\mathcal{M}')^{\iota=1}$$

with Frobenius induced by Frobenius on $\mathcal{M}'$. This defines a functor from $Y^{[0, 2], \tau}(R)$ to $\Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R)$. Finally, recall the functor $\varepsilon_0 : \Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R) \rightarrow \Phi\text{-Mod}_{W(k)}^{\text{ét}}(R)$ from [LLHLM] §2.3. It is obtained by considering the f -fold composite of the partial Frobenii acting on $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$.

Let R be a local, Artinian $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra with finite residue field $\mathbb{F}$. We have the usual functor $\mathbb{V}_K^*$ (resp. $\mathbb{V}_{K'}^*$) from $\Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R)$ (resp. $\Phi\text{-Mod}_{K'}^{\text{ét}}(R)$) to G_{K_∞} representations over R . Recall from [LLHLM], 6.1 the functor

$$T_{dd'}^* : Y^{[0, 2], \tau}(R) \rightarrow G_{K_\infty}$$

which can either be defined as $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \mapsto \mathbb{V}_{K'}^*(\mathcal{M}')$ (in which case the $G_{K'_\infty}$ action descends canonically to G_{K_∞} , cf. [LLHLM], Proposition 6.4), or as $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \mapsto \mathbb{V}_K^*(\mathcal{M})$. From now onwards, we write T_{dd}^* for the functor which was written as $T_{dd'}^*$ in [LLHLM], §6.1.

We can now state the main result of this section, which is a sharpening of [LLHLM], Proposition 2.27.

Proposition 3.1.2. *Let $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \in Y^{[0, 2], \tau}(R)$ and β be an eigenbasis of $\mathfrak{M}$. Let $(s_j)_j$ be an orientation for τ and write $A^{(j)} = \text{Mat}_\beta(\phi_{\mathfrak{M}, s_{j+1}(3)}^{(j)})$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathfrak{M} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, L'})^{\Delta=1} \in \Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R)$.*

Then there is a basis $\mathfrak{f} = (\mathfrak{f}^{(j)})_j$ for $\mathcal{M}$ such that for $j < f - 1$,

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}) = s_{j+1} \cdot A^{(j)} \begin{pmatrix} v^{a_{s_{j+1}(1), f-1-j}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a_{s_{j+1}(2), f-1-j}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a_{s_{j+1}(3), f-1-j}} \end{pmatrix} s_{j+1}^{-1}$$

and

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(f-1)}) = s_0 \cdot A^{(f-1)} (s_0^{-1} s_{\tau}^{-1} s_0) \begin{pmatrix} v^{a_{s_0(1), 0}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a_{s_0(2), 0}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a_{s_0(3), 0}} \end{pmatrix} s_0^{-1}.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct computation using [LLHLM], Proposition 2.27, Proposition 6.1 and Proposition 6.8.

We freely use the notations on base change of Breuil-Kisin modules, as in [LLHLM], §6.1. If $(\mathbf{a}_k)_{k=1,2,3}$ is the triple associated to τ , we let $\mathbf{a}'_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}^{f'}$ be the triple associated to the base change τ' to K' , i.e., $a'_{k,j+if} = a_{s_{\tau}^i(k), j}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq r-1$, $0 \leq j \leq f-1$. We write (s_j) and $(s'_{j'})$ for the orientations of $\mathbf{a}_k$ and $\mathbf{a}'_k$ respectively. Let $\beta'^{(j')} = (f'_1(j'), f'_2(j'), f'_3(j'))$ be an eigenbasis for $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota)$ and write $A^{(j')} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Mat}_{\beta'}(\phi_{\mathfrak{M}', s'_{j'+1}(3)}^{(j')})$.

Then

$$\mathfrak{f}'^{(j')} := \{u^{\mathbf{a}'_1(j')} f'_1(j'), u^{\mathbf{a}'_2(j')} f'_2(j'), u^{\mathbf{a}'_3(j')} f'_3(j')\}$$

is a collection of basis for $\mathcal{M}'^{(j')} = (\mathfrak{M}'^{(j')}[1/u])^{\Delta'=1}$. Since $\iota(\beta'^{(j')}) = \beta'^{(j'+f)}$, we see that for each $0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1$, the collection $\{\beta'^{(j'+(r-1)f)}, \iota(\beta'^{(j'+(r-1)f)}), \dots, \iota^{(r-1)}(\beta'^{(j'+(r-1)f)})\}$ defines a basis $\mathfrak{f}^{(j)}$ for $\mathcal{M}^{(j)}$. It remains to compute $\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)})$.

For any $0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1$, a direct computation (using [LLHLM] Proposition 2.13 and the definition of $(\mathfrak{f}'^{(f'-1-j')}, \mathfrak{f}'^{(f'-j')})$) gives

$$(3.2) \quad \text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}'}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}'}^{(f'-1-j')}) = s'_{f'-j} \cdot A'^{(f'-1-j')} \begin{pmatrix} v^{a'_{s'_{f'-j}(1), j'}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a'_{s'_{f'-j}(2), j'}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a'_{s'_{f'-j}(3), j'}} \end{pmatrix} (s'_{f'-1-j'})^{-1}.$$

We now observe that for any $j \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ we have:

- (1) $A'^{(f-1-j)+(r-1-i)f} = A'^{[f-1-j]}$ depends only on j (cf. [LLHLM], proof of Proposition 6.8);
- (2) $s'_{(r-i-1)f+(f-j)} = s_{\tau}^{-i+\delta_{j,0}} s_{[f-j]}$
- (3) $a'_{s'_{(r-i-1)f+(f-j)}(k), j+if} = a_{s_{\tau}^i(j), 0} s_{[f-j]}(k), j$

(where $[f-j] \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ is defined by $[f-j] \equiv f-j$ modulo f). Hence for any $j \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ and noting that $f' - j = (r-1)f + (f-j)$ the expression (3.2) becomes

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}'}^{(f'-1-j)}) = s_{f-j} \cdot A^{(f-1-j)} \begin{pmatrix} v^{a_{s_{f-j}(1), j}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a_{s_{f-j}(2), j}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a_{s_{f-j}(3), j}} \end{pmatrix} (s_{f-j})^{-1}$$

if $j \neq 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mat}_{\mathcal{V}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}'}^{(f'-1-j)}) &= s_{\tau}s_0 \cdot A^{(f-1)} \begin{pmatrix} v^{a_{s_{\tau}s_0(1),j}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a_{s_{\tau}s_0(2),j}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a_{s_{\tau}s_0(3),j}} \end{pmatrix} (s_{\tau}s_0)^{-1} \\ &= s_{\tau}s_0 A^{(f-1)} s_0^{-1} s_{\tau}^{-1} s_0 \begin{pmatrix} v^{a_{s_0(1),j}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^{a_{s_0(2),j}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v^{a_{s_0(3),j}} \end{pmatrix} s_0^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

if $j = 0$. By composing with the isomorphism $\mathcal{M}'^{(0)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}'^{(r-1)f}$, and noting that the difference in the ordering of the basis $\iota^{r-1}(\mathfrak{f}'^{(r-1)f})$ and $\mathfrak{f}'^{(0)}$ is given by s_{τ} we obtain the desired result. $\square$

Corollary 3.1.3. *Let $\mathfrak{M}$, β and (s_j) be as in Proposition 3.1.2. Then there exists a basis $(\mathfrak{f}^{(j)})$ for $\mathcal{M}$ such that*

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}) = A^{(j)} s_{j+1}^{-1} s_j v^{s_j^{-1}(\mu_{f-1-j})} = A^{(j)} s_{\tau,\mu,j} v^{s_j^{-1}(\mu_{f-1-j})}$$

where $s_f := s_{\tau}s_0$ and $s_{\tau,\mu}$ is defined in (3.1).

Proof. The second two expressions are the same by (3.1). Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}$ be the basis from Proposition 3.1.2. We form a new basis $\mathfrak{f}^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_j \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^{(j)}$. Then, for $j \neq f-1$,

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}) = A^{(j)} v^{s_{j+1}(\mu_{f-1-j})} s_{j+1}^{-1} s_j$$

which gives the desired result. A similar calculation holds when $j = f-1$. $\square$

Proposition 3.1.4. *Let $(\mathfrak{M}, \iota) \in Y^{[0,2],\tau}(R)$ and let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathfrak{M} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'})^{\Delta=1} \in \Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(R)$ be the associated étale φ -module over K .*

If $\mathfrak{f}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{M}$ and $B^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)})$ are the matrices of the partial Frobenii, then the étale φ^f -module $\varepsilon_0(\mathcal{M})$ is described by

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}(0)}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}(0)}^f) = \prod_{j=0}^{f-1} \varphi^j(B^{(f-j-1)}).$$

3.2. Semisimple Kisin modules. Theorem 2.22 in [LLHLM] gives a classification of Kisin modules with descent datum which can arise from reductions of potentially crystalline representations with Hodge–Tate weights $(2, 1, 0)^f$. In this subsection, we identify Kisin modules which correspond to semisimple Galois representations in an explicit way (Theorem 3.2.10).

For $\mathbb{F}'/\mathbb{F}$ finite, let $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}') \subset \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}'[[v]])$ be the Iwahori subgroup of elements which are upper triangular modulo v . Let h be a positive integer. Recall the notion of shape:

Definition 3.2.1. Let τ be a principal series type, and let $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_0, \tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_{f-1}) \in \widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_n}^f$. A Kisin module $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F}')$ has *shape* $\mathbf{w}$ if for any eigenbasis β , the matrices $(A^{(j)})_j = (\text{Mat}_{\beta}(\phi_{\mathfrak{M},s_{j+1}(3)}^{(j)}))_j$ have the property that $A^{(j)} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}') \tilde{w}_j \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}')$.

For a non-principal series type, we define *shape* in terms of the base change (see Definition 6.6 in [LLHLM]).

Let $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$. Let $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ effective, i.e., $\lambda_j = (a_{1,j}, a_{2,j}, a_{3,j})$ with $a_{i,j} \geq 0$. A key input for weight elimination is the following:

Theorem 3.2.2. *If $\bar{\rho}$ has a potentially crystalline lift with type (λ, τ) , then there is a Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F}')$ of shape $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_0, \tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_{f-1}) \in \mathrm{Adm}^-(\lambda)$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$.*

Proof. This is direct consequence of Proposition 5.4 and Corollary 5.18 of [CL]. $\square$

In particular, one can eliminate types by classifying Kisin modules of shape $\mathbf{w} \in \mathrm{Adm}^-(\eta)$. For generic τ , this classification was carried out in §2 of [LLHLM]. However, it remains to match Kisin modules with their corresponding Galois representations. For this, we introduce the notion of semisimple Kisin module of shape $\mathbf{w}$. We continue to allow non-principal series types with notation as in previous subsection.

Definition 3.2.3. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$. We say that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is *semisimple* of shape $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_j)$ if there exists a finite extension $\mathbb{F}'/\mathbb{F}$ and an eigenbasis β of $\mathfrak{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ such that

$$A^{(j)} \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}'[[v]])\tilde{w}_j$$

for $0 \leq j \leq f-1$

Remark 3.2.4. For a 3-generic type τ and any $\bar{\rho}$, there exists at most one Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{\rho}}$ with height in $[0, 2]$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{\rho}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$ by Theorem 3.2 [LLHLM]. In this case, $\bar{\rho}$ is semisimple if and only if $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{\rho}}$ is semisimple as will be shown in Theorem 3.2.10.

Proposition 3.2.5. *If $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w}$, then $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$ is semisimple.*

Proof. If $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple, we can choose a basis such that $A^{(j)} \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}[[v]])\tilde{w}_j$. Using this basis, we see by Proposition 3.1.2 and 3.1.4 that the matrix for the étale φ^f -module $\varepsilon_0(\mathfrak{M}[1/u]^{\Delta=1})$ lies in $\mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}((v)))s$ for some $s \in S_3$. If s has order d , then $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$ restricted to the unramified extension of K_∞ of degree d is a direct sum of characters and so $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$ is semisimple. $\square$

Proposition 3.2.6. *If $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_j)$, then there exists an eigenbasis β such that*

$$A^{(j)} = \tilde{w}_j \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq f-2, \quad A^{(f-1)} \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F})\tilde{w}_{f-1}$$

Proof. Assume that τ is a principal series type. Let $\mathbf{T}_n(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ be the subgroup consisting of diagonal matrices D such that $D \equiv \text{id} \pmod{v^n}$. Observe that $\tilde{w}_j \mathbf{T}_n(\mathbb{F}) \tilde{w}_j^{-1} = \mathbf{T}_n(\mathbb{F})$. Thus, if $A^{(j)} = D_1^{(j)} \tilde{w}_j D_2^{(j)}$ with $D_i^{(j)} \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$, then we can rewrite $A^{(j)}$ as $D_1^{*,(j)} \tilde{w}_j$. Furthermore, if $D_2^{(j)} \in \mathbf{T}_n(\mathbb{F})$, then $D_1^{(j)} \equiv D_1^{*,(j)} \pmod{v^n}$. Next, if $A^{(j)} = D_1^{(j)} \tilde{w}_j$, we write $D_1^{(j)} = D_1^{*,(j)} \overline{D}_1^{(j)}$ with $\overline{D}_1^{(j)} \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F})$. We can make a change of basis with $I^{(j+1)} = (D_1^{*,(j)})^{-1}$ (see Proposition 2.15 [LLHLM]). Using that $\varphi(\mathbf{T}_n(\mathbb{F})) = \mathbf{T}_{pn}(\mathbb{F})$, repeating this procedure converges to a basis with the desired property. A similar argument works for non-principal series types. $\square$

Proposition 3.2.7. *Let $\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}'$ be semisimple representations of G_K . Assume there exists $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w}$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$. Then $\bar{\rho}'|_{I_K} \cong \bar{\rho}|_{I_K}$ if and only if there exists a semisimple $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$ of shape $\mathbf{w}$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}') \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$.*

Proof. This is essentially just counting unramified twists using Proposition 3.2.6. $\square$

For any $\lambda \in X^*(T)$ effective, let $Y^{\lambda, \tau}(\mathbb{F}) \subset Y^{[0, h], \tau}(\mathbb{F})$ for some $h \geq 0$ be the subset of Kisin modules with shape in $\text{Adm}^-(\lambda)$. In §5 [CL], this is shown to be a closed subspace of moduli of Kisin modules.

Remark 3.2.8. When τ is 3-generic, [LLHLM] shows that $Y_{\bar{\rho}}^{\eta, \tau}(\mathbb{F}) \subset Y_{\bar{\rho}}^{[0, 2], \tau}(\mathbb{F})$ consists of a single point. Moreover, this unique Kisin module has a gauge basis which is unique up to scaling. Since the only monomial matrices $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}) \tilde{w} \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F})$ are $\mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F}[[v]]) \tilde{w}$, Proposition 3.2.6 therefore shows that this Kisin module is semisimple (of shape $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Adm}^-(\eta)$) if and only if the matrices of partial Frobenii with respect to one (equivalently, any) gauge basis are monomial.

The following Lemma is well-known:

Lemma 3.2.9. *If $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ admits a potentially crystalline lift of type (λ, τ) , then so does $\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}$ (after possibly extending $\mathbb{F}$).*

Proof. Fix a characteristic 0 lift ρ of $\bar{\rho}$ which is potentially crystalline of type (λ, τ) . Then by enlarging the coefficient ring of ρ , we can always find a lattice whose reduction is semisimple. $\square$

This allows us to reduce weight elimination to the case of semisimple representations, which will be based on the following:

Theorem 3.2.10. *Let $\bar{\rho}$ be a semisimple representation of G_K . Assume that either $\bar{\rho}$ is completely reducible or $\lambda = \eta$ and τ is 3-generic.*

If there exists a Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\lambda, \tau}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$, then there exists a semisimple Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$ of shape $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Adm}^-(\lambda)$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}') \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$.

Combining Theorem 3.2.10 with Proposition 3.2.7, we see that for a fixed 3-generic type τ the set of semisimple $\bar{\rho}|_{I_K}$ which arise as the reduction of potentially crystalline representations of type (η, τ) correspond to a subset of $\text{Adm}^-((2, 1, 0))^f$. In fact, this admissibility condition exactly captures those semisimple $\bar{\rho}$ which are reductions of crystalline representations of type (η, τ) .

Proof of Theorem 3.2.10. We first treat the case where $\bar{\rho}$ is completely reducible. Let $\mathcal{M}_{dd} = \overline{\mathfrak{M}}[1/u]$ be an étale φ -module with descent datum as in §2.3 of [LLHLM]. Since $\mathbb{V}_{dd}^*$ is an equivalence of categories, if $\bar{\rho}$ is completely reducible then $\mathcal{M}_{dd} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2 \oplus \mathcal{M}_3$ where each $\mathcal{M}_i$ is stable under $\phi_{\mathcal{M}_{dd}}$ and the descent datum.

Let $Y_{\mathcal{M}_{dd}}^{\lambda, \tau}$ be the Kisin variety parametrizing lattices in $\mathcal{M}_{dd}$ with type (λ, τ) (see Definition 3.1 [LLHLM]). The torus $\mathbf{T} = \mathbb{G}_m^3$ acts on $\mathcal{M}_{dd}$ by scaling individually in each factor. As a consequence, we get an algebraic action of $\mathbf{T}$ on the projective variety $Y_{\mathcal{M}_{dd}}^{\lambda, \tau}$.

Any such action has a fixed point. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}' \subset Y_{\mathcal{M}_{dd}}^{\lambda, \tau}(\mathbb{F}')$ be a $\mathbf{T}$ -fixed point. Let $\chi_i : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$ denote the projection onto each coordinate and set $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_i := (\overline{\mathfrak{M}}')^{\chi_i}$. Then

$$(3.3) \quad \overline{\mathfrak{M}}' = \overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_1 \oplus \overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_2 \oplus \overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_3$$

Since the $\mathbf{T}$ -action commutes with $\phi_{\mathcal{M}_{dd}}$ and Δ , each $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_i$ is stable under both, hence $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_i$ is in fact a rank one Kisin module with descent datum. Any choice of eigenbasis which respects this decomposition shows that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$ is semisimple. Because $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$ is in $Y^{\lambda, \tau}(\mathbb{F}')$, it is semisimple with an admissible shape $\mathbf{w}$.

Now suppose that τ is 3-generic, but $\bar{\rho}$ is not necessarily completely reducible. In this case the Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ of type (η, τ) is unique. We make a base change to the unramified extension K'/K of degree 6. Let τ' be the base change of τ to K' , and let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}' = \text{BC}(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$ be the base change of the Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$.

Since $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$ is the unique Kisin module of type (η, τ') , by the above argument, it must be semisimple. Since the base change of a gauge basis of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a gauge basis of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'$, by Remark 3.2.8, the matrices of partial Frobenii of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ with respect to a gauge basis are monomial, and hence $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple. $\square$

Remark 3.2.11. In the proof of Theorem 3.2.10, while Δ' acts on $(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}'_1)^{(j)} \bmod u$ through one of the characters η_1, η_2 or η_3 , it need not be the same character for each j . This is why even though $\phi_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}$ is “diagonal,” the individual $A^{(j)}$ need not be diagonal, but only monomial.

3.3. Shapes and Serre weights. In this subsection, we combine the previous subsection with §2.2. Namely, for each semisimple representation $\bar{\rho}$ which appears as the reduction of generic type τ , we determine the intersection of predicted weights of $\bar{\rho}$ with the Jordan–Hölder factors of τ (Proposition 3.3.8).

Definition 3.3.1. A Galois representation $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is said to be n -generic if the associated K -type $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v})$ (see Example 2.2.1) is n -generic in the sense of Definition 2.1.10.

It follows immediately from the definition that the notion of n -genericity is insensitive to restriction to unramified extensions. Concretely, Definition 3.3.1 says that a niveau f Galois representation $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is n -generic if there exists a weight $\mu = (a_{1,j}, a_{2,j}, a_{3,j})_j \in X^*(\underline{T})$ and $(s_j) \in W(\underline{G})$ with $n < a_{i,j} - a_{i+1,j}$ and $a_{1,j} - a_{3,j} < p - n$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $j \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$, such that $\bar{\rho}|_{I_K} \cong \omega_f^{\sum_j a_{s_j(1),j} p^j} \oplus \omega_f^{\sum_j a_{s_j(2),j} p^j} \oplus \omega_f^{\sum_j a_{s_j(3),j} p^j}$.

We will next compute $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_K})$ in terms of shape for a semisimple $\bar{\rho}$. This will effectively allow us to determine $W^2(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$ via the combinatorics of §2 especially Corollary 2.2.13.

In the duality between Galois representations and tame types, the following adjoint naturally appears:

Definition 3.3.2. (1) For $w = (w_j) \in W(\underline{G})$, let $w^* = (w_j^*) \in W(\underline{G})$ be defined by $w_j^* = w_{f-1-j}^{-1}$.
 (2) For $\nu = (\nu_j) \in X(\underline{T})$, let $\nu^* = (\nu_j^*) \in X(\underline{T})$ be defined by $\nu_j^* = \nu_{f-1-j}$.
 (3) For $\tilde{w} = wt_\nu \in \widetilde{W}$, let $\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}$ be defined by $\tilde{w}^* = t_{\nu^*} w^*$.

Note that $\tilde{w} \mapsto \tilde{w}^*$ is an antihomomorphism of groups.

Lemma 3.3.3. Let $\bar{\rho}$ be a semisimple representation of G_K . Let $\mathcal{M} \in \Phi^f\text{-Mod}_{W(k)}^{\text{ét}}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\mathbb{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$. If there exists a basis for $\mathcal{M}$ such that the ϕ^f -action on $\mathcal{M}$ is given by $Ds^{-1}v^\lambda$ where $D \in \mathbf{T}(\mathbb{F})$ and $s \in S_3$, then $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}) = R_s(\lambda)$.

Proof. Let k be the order of s . Then

$$\phi^k(e_i) = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \phi^{k-1-j}(D_{s^{-j}(i)}) \right) v^{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} p^{f(k-1-j)} \lambda_{s^{-j}(i)}} e_i = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \phi^j(D_{s^{j+1}(i)}) \right) v^{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} p^{fj} \lambda_{s^{j+1}(i)}} e_i.$$

Hence $\bar{\rho}|_{I_v}$ is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^3 \omega_{kf}^{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} p^{fj} \lambda_{s^{j+1}(i)}}$. The lemma now follows from Example 2.2.1. $\square$

Definition 3.3.4. More generally, for any $\mathbf{w} = (w_j t_{\lambda_j}) \in \widetilde{W}$, let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}) \in \Phi\text{-Mod}_K^{\text{ét}}(\mathbb{F})$ be finite free over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \otimes \mathbb{F}$ such that

$$\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)} : \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w})^{(j)} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w})^{(j+1)}$$

is given by $w_j v^{\lambda_j}$. If $t_\lambda w = (t_{\lambda_j} w_j) \in \widetilde{W}$, define

$$\tau(w, \lambda) := \mathbb{V}^*(\mathcal{M}((t_\lambda w)^*))|_{I_K}.$$

Implicitly, we are using that semisimple representations of G_{K_∞} extend canonically to G_K .

Proposition 3.3.5. *We have*

$$V(\tau(w, \lambda)) = R_w(\lambda)$$

Proof. One easily checks that the ϕ^f -action on $\varepsilon_0(\mathcal{M}((t_\lambda w)^*)) \in \Phi^f\text{-Mod}_{W(k)}^{\text{ét}}(\mathbb{F})$ in the basis arising from $\mathcal{M}((t_\lambda w)^*)$ is given by $\prod_{j=0}^{f-1} w_j^{-1} v^{p^j \lambda_j}$. Similarly, the ϕ^f -action of $\varepsilon_0(\mathcal{M}((st_\lambda w \pi(s)^{-1})^*)) \in \Phi^f\text{-Mod}_{W(k)}^{\text{ét}}(\mathbb{F})$ is given by

$$\prod_{j=0}^{f-1} s_{j-1} w_j^{-1} s_j^{-1} v^{p^j s_j \lambda_j} = s_{f-1} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{f-1} w_j^{-1} v^{p^j \lambda_j} \right) s_{f-1}^{-1}.$$

We conclude that $\varepsilon_0(\mathcal{M}(t_\lambda w)^*) \cong \varepsilon_0(\mathcal{M}((st_\lambda w \pi(s)^{-1})^*))$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{M}((t_\lambda w)^*) \cong \mathcal{M}((st_\lambda w \pi(s)^{-1})^*).$$

As $R_w(\lambda) \cong R_{s_w \pi(s)^{-1}}(s\lambda)$ by Lemma 4.2 of [Her09], we reduce to the case when $w_i = ()$ for $i \neq f-1$. Now the proposition follows from Lemma 3.3.3. $\square$

Let $\mu = (a_{1,j}, a_{2,j}, a_{3,j}) \in X^*(\underline{T})$. Let $(s_j) \in W(\underline{G})$ be the orientation of μ with $\tau \cong \tau(s_\tau, -\mu)$ as in §3.1. We would like to determine $V(\bar{\rho}|_{I_K})$ as a function of the shape of $\bar{\rho}$ relative to τ .

We record the following:

Proposition 3.3.6. *The K -type τ is isomorphic to $R_{s_{\tau,\mu}}^*(s^*(\mu))$ where $s_{\tau,\mu}$ is as in (3.1) and $s^*(\mu) - \eta$ is in $\underline{C}_0$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of formula before (4.1) in [Her09] where we note that in our notation $F = \pi$ and $(\pi^{-1}s)^* = \pi(s^*)$. Note that $s^*(\mu) - \eta$ is lower alcove by the genericity conditions. $\square$

Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ be a Kisin module with descent data τ . Let $s_{\tau,\mu}$ be as in (3.1). Suppose that $\bar{\rho}$ is semisimple and $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K^\infty}} \cong T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$.

Proposition 3.3.7. *Assume $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_j) \in \widetilde{W}$, then, with the notation as above,*

$$V(T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})|_{I_K}) = R_{s_{\tau,\mu} \tilde{w}^*}(s^*(\mu)).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.2.7, it suffices to check the claim for one semisimple Kisin module of shape $\mathbf{w}$. We can assume then that $A^{(j)} = \tilde{w}_j$ for all j . If we let $\tilde{w}^* = t_{\nu^*} w^*$, then

$$R_{s_{\tau,\mu} \tilde{w}^*}(s^*(\mu)) = R_{s_{\tau,\mu} w^*}(s^*(\mu) + s_{\tau,\mu}^*(\nu^*)).$$

By Proposition 3.3.5, it suffices to show that

$$\overline{\mathfrak{M}}[1/u]^{\Delta=1} \cong \mathcal{M}(\tilde{w}_{s_{\tau,\mu} t_{s(\mu^*)+s_{\tau,\mu}(\nu)}}).$$

This is direct consequence of Corollary 3.1.3. $\square$

Proposition 3.3.8. *Let $\bar{\rho}$ be semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Adm}^-((2, 1, 0)^f)$ with respect to a 5-generic tame type τ . Fixing $s_{\tau, \mu}^*$ and $s^*(\mu)$ and using Proposition 2.2.7,*

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau) = \{ \sigma_{(\omega, a)} : (\omega_j, a_j) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j^*} \} \subset \text{JH}(R_{s_{\tau, \mu}^*}(s^*(\mu)))$$

where $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j^*}$ is as in Table 4.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.2.13 and Proposition 3.3.7. $\square$

Remark 3.3.9. There is an explicit list of elements of $\text{Adm}^-(2, 1, 0)$ given in Table 1 of [LLHLM]. The effect of adjoint operation (in addition to reversing the order of embeddings) is to reverse the order of the word and to turn $\gamma = (13)v^{(1, 0, -1)}$ into γ^+ . In particular, $(\cdot)^*$ defines a bijection between $\text{Adm}^-(2, 1, 0)$ and $\text{Adm}^+(2, 1, 0)$.

3.3.1. Type elimination results. We assume throughout that $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is 6-generic, in particular, $V(\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}|_{I_K}) = R_{s'}(\mu')$ for some $s' \in W(\underline{G})$ and $\mu' \in X^*(\underline{T})$ with $\mu' - \eta$ is 6-deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$.

Proposition 3.3.10. *Let τ be a tame inertial type. If $\bar{\rho}$ arises as the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type $((2, 1, 0), \tau)$ then*

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}, \bar{\tau}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. First, assume that τ is 3-generic. By Theorem 3.2.2 combined with Lemma 3.2.9, there exist $\bar{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\eta, \tau}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\bar{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong (\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}})^{\text{ss}}$. In fact, by Theorem 3.2.10, we can take $\bar{\mathfrak{M}}$ to be semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_j) \in \text{Adm}^-(\eta)$. By Propositions 3.3.7 and Corollary 2.2.13, we conclude that

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}, \tau) \neq \emptyset.$$

If τ is not 3-generic, then the Proposition below shows that $\bar{\rho}$ does not arise as the reduction of potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) for any such τ . $\square$

Proposition 3.3.11. *If τ is not 3-generic, then $\bar{\rho}$ cannot arise as the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) .*

Proof. Let $\bar{\rho}$ be the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) which is 6-generic. Genericity conditions can be checked after base change so we can assume that τ is a principal series type and $\bar{\rho}$ is niveau 1. Let $\tau = \tau(s, -(\mu + \eta))$ where $\mu \in \underline{C}_0$. Following the computation in Proposition 3.3.7, we see that the inertial weights of $\bar{\rho}$ are given by $\lambda + \eta$ where $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu + s'\nu$ where $s' \in W(\underline{G})$ and $\nu_i \in \{\eta_i^{(i)}, 0\}$ for all i . We deduce from Definition 3.3.1 that for some (ν', σ)

$$R_1(\lambda + \eta) \cong R_{\sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})}(\sigma(\lambda + \eta) + p\nu' - \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu')$$

where $\sigma(\lambda + \eta) - \eta + p\nu' - \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu'$ is 6-deep in alcove $\underline{C}_0$. We have for any coroot $\alpha^\vee$

$$6 < |\langle \sigma(\lambda + \eta) + p\nu' - \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle| < p - 6$$

$$|\langle \lambda + \eta, \alpha^\vee \rangle| = |\langle \mu + \eta + s'\nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle| \leq p + 2$$

It follows that

$$|\langle p\nu' - \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle| < 2p - 4$$

Let $M = \max_{\alpha^\vee} \{\langle \nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle\}$. Then $(p - 1)M < 2p - 4$, hence $M < 2$. Repeating the same argument with min replacing max, we get

$$|\langle \nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle| < 2$$

Since

$$\langle \sigma(\lambda + \eta) + p\nu' - \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle = \langle \sigma(\mu + \eta), \alpha^\vee \rangle + p\langle \nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle - \langle \sigma\pi(\sigma^{-1})\pi\nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle + \langle \sigma(s'\nu), \alpha^\vee \rangle$$

we deduce that $\langle \mu + \eta, \sigma^{-1}\alpha^\vee \rangle + p\langle \nu', \alpha^\vee \rangle$ is in $(3, p - 3)$ for $\alpha^\vee$ positive. This forces τ to be 3-deep. $\square$

3.4. Serre weight conjectures. We are now ready to prove an abstract version of the Serre weight conjecture as well as numerical Breuil–Mézard statement. Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation. We follow verbatim the general setup and notation of [LLHLM], §7.1.

For each place $v|p$ of F^+ , fix a place $\tilde{v}$ of F such that $\tilde{v}|_{F^+} = v$. Let $R_{\tilde{v}}^\square$ denote the unrestricted universal $\mathcal{O}$ -framed deformation ring of $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}} := \bar{r}|_{G_{F_{\tilde{v}}}}$. Fix a natural number h and let

$$R_\infty = \left(\bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\tilde{v}}^\square \right) \llbracket x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h \rrbracket \text{ and } X_\infty = \text{Spf } R_\infty.$$

If $\tau_{\tilde{v}}$ is an inertial type for $G_{F_{\tilde{v}}}$, then let $R_{\tilde{v}}^{\square, \tau_{\tilde{v}}}$ be the universal $\mathcal{O}$ -framed deformation ring of $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}$ of type $\tau_{\tilde{v}}$. If $\tau = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_{\tilde{v}}$, then let

$$R_\infty(\tau) = \left(\bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p} R_{\tilde{v}}^{\square, \tau_{\tilde{v}}} \right) \llbracket x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h \rrbracket \text{ and } X_\infty(\tau) = \text{Spf } R_\infty(\tau).$$

Let $d + 1$ be the dimension of $R_\infty(\tau)$ (the dimension is independent of τ by Theorem 3.3.4 of [Kis08]). We denote by $\overline{R}_v^\square$, $\overline{R}_\infty$, etc. the reduction of these objects modulo ϖ . The following definition is a modification of Definition 7.11 in [LLHLM].

Definition 3.4.1. A *weak minimal patching functor* for $\bar{r}$ is defined to be a covariant exact functor $M_\infty : \text{Rep}_K(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(X_\infty)$ satisfying the following axioms:

- (1) Let $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$, where for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, τ_v is an inertial type. By abuse of notation, we write τ_v (resp. $\tau = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$) for the associated K_v -type (resp. $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} K_v$ -type) via [CEG⁺, Theorem 3.7]. If τ° is an $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice in τ , then $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)$ is p -torsion free and is maximally Cohen–Macaulay over $R_\infty(\tau)$;
- (2) if $\sigma = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v$, where for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$ the σ_v are irreducible $\mathcal{G}(k_v)$ -representations over $\mathbb{F}$, the module $M_\infty(\sigma)$ is either 0 or its support is equidimensional of dimension d , and $M_\infty(\sigma)$ is maximally Cohen–Macaulay over its support; and
- (3) the locally free sheaf $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)[1/p]$ (being maximal Cohen–Macaulay over the regular generic fiber of $X_\infty(\tau)$) has rank at most one on each connected component.

Assume that a weak minimal patching functor M_∞ exists. Following Definition 3.2.6 in [GHS], let $W^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r})$ be the set of irreducible $\prod_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathcal{G}(k_v)$ -representations $\sigma = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v$ over $\mathbb{F}$ such that $M_\infty(\sigma)$ is nonzero (note that *a priori* this set depends on the choice of M_∞). For an R_∞ -module M , define $e(M)$ to be the Hilbert–Samuel multiplicity of M as an R_∞ -module.

Definition 3.4.2. Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation which is locally semisimple and 6-generic at all places dividing p . Define the set of *predicted Serre weights* to be

$$W^?(\bar{r}) := \{ \sigma = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v \mid \sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_v) \}.$$

We define the *defect* of $\bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{r})$ to be the sum of the defects of each $\sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_v)$.

For notational convenience if $\tau = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ is a tame K -type, we set

$$W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W^?(\bar{r}) \cap \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}).$$

Let $W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r}) \subset W^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r})$ be the subset of $\sigma = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v$ such that for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$ the $\mathcal{G}(k_v)$ representation σ_v appears as a Jordan–Hölder factor of some tame K -type τ_v .

Theorem 3.4.3. Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation which is locally semisimple and 6-generic at all places dividing p . Let M_∞ be a weak patching functor for $\bar{r}$ such that $W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r}) \neq \emptyset$.

Then for all Serre weights σ which appear as a constituent of some tame type, we have $e(M_\infty(\sigma)) = 1$ if $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{r})$ and $e(M_\infty(\sigma)) = 0$ otherwise. In particular, $W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r}) = W^?(\bar{r})$.

Remark 3.4.4. The reason we work with only with weights appearing in tame types is only for convenience. For $\bar{r}$ generic enough, one can show that $W^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r}) \setminus W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{r}) = \emptyset$ as follows: Even though not all Serre weights occur in the reduction of a tame type, they do occur in the reduction of $V_\lambda \otimes \tau$ where V_λ is the standard representation of $\underline{G}$. The results of Section 3.2 hold also for potentially crystalline representations of type $(\lambda + \eta, \tau)$ (with possibly stronger genericity hypothesis), and then the same argument in the proof of Proposition 3.4.7 gives the result.

Theorem 3.4.5. *Let τ be a 3-generic tame inertial type and $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ a 6-generic semisimple Galois representation. Then the number of irreducible components of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)} / \varpi$ is equal to the number of elements in $W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$.*

The proofs of Theorems 3.4.3 and 3.4.5 appear at the end of this subsection after a series of lemmas. The main lemma proving existence is an induction on defect (Lemma 3.4.11).

Recall that we have a length function $\ell : \widetilde{W}_{\text{GL}_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (for the anti-dominant choice of base alcove).

Lemma 3.4.6. *With the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4.5, suppose further that $\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau) = (\tilde{w}_0, \dots, \tilde{w}_{f-1})$ where $\ell(\tilde{w}_j) > 1$ for every j . Then the number of irreducible components of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)} / \varpi$ is equal to the number of elements in $W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$.*

Proof. In §5.3 and §6 of [LLHLM], we gave an explicit presentation for $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)}$ whenever the length of $\tilde{w}_j$ is at least 2. For each shape, there were two possible cases depending on the mod p Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{\rho}}$ uniquely associated to $\bar{\rho}$. By Proposition 3.2.7 and Proposition 3.2.10, whenever $\bar{\rho}$ is semisimple, $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is semisimple in the sense of Definition 3.2.1 and so $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ lies in the special locus for the given shape.

It is easy to see from Table 6 in *loc. cit.* that

$$|\text{Irr}(R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)} / \varpi)| = \prod_j 2^{4-\ell(\tilde{w}_j)}.$$

Finally, we compare this with the size of $W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$ which is $\prod_j |\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j^*}|$ by Proposition 3.3.8 using Table 4. $\square$

We begin with weight elimination which is a consequence of the results from the previous two subsections. 4

Proposition 3.4.7 (weight elimination). *Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a representation such that $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}$ is 6-generic for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. Then*

$$W_t^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r}) \subset \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} W^?(\bar{\rho}_v^{\mathrm{ss}}).$$

In particular, if $\sigma = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v$ is a Serre weight such that $\sigma_v \notin W^?(\bar{\rho}_v^{\mathrm{ss}})$ for some $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, then $M_\infty(\sigma) = 0$.

Proof. This reduces to a local question. By Lemma 3.2.9, if $\bar{\rho}$ is the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) then so is $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$. By Proposition 3.3.10, for any tame inertial type τ if $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\rho}) = \emptyset$, then $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is not the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) . Hence, $\bar{\rho}$ is also not the reduction of a potentially crystalline representation of type (η, τ) by Lemma 3.2.9. Thus, the set of tame types for which $\bar{\rho}$ could be modular is contained in the set of types such that

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}, \bar{\tau}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Finally, we claim that type elimination implies weight elimination, that is for any $F(\lambda) \notin W^?(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}})$ such that λ which appears as a Jordan–Hölder factor of some tame type, there exists a type τ such that $F(\lambda) \in \mathrm{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}) = \emptyset$. This follows from Corollary 2.2.15. $\square$

Lemma 3.4.8. *Let $\tau = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ be a tame inertial type where for each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$ the K_v -type τ_v verifies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.4.6. Then either $M_\infty(\bar{\tau}) = 0$ or the multiplicity of $M_\infty(\bar{\tau})$ is equal to the multiplicity of $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\square, \tau_v, (0,1,2)} / \varpi$.*

Proof. Let τ° be an $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice in τ . In the notation of Section 7.3 of [LLHLM], $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)$ has full support on $X_\infty(\tau)$ if and only if $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)[\frac{1}{p}]$ has full support on the generic fiber of $X_\infty(\tau)$ as $R_\infty(\tau)$ is p -torsion free. Since the generic fiber of $X_\infty(\tau)$ is irreducible, either $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)$ has full support on $X_\infty(\tau)$ or $M_\infty(\tau^\circ) = 0$. The lemma now follows from Proposition 7.14 of [LLHLM]. $\square$

Corollary 3.4.9. *Suppose that $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is a Galois representation and $\tau = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ is a 3-generic tame type such that for each place $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, we have $\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_v) = (\tilde{w}_j)_j$ where $\ell(\tilde{w}_j) > 1$ for all j . Then the multiplicity of $\otimes_v R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\square, \tau_v, (0,1,2)} / \varpi$ is equal to the number of elements in $W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 3.4.6 and properties of tensor products of representations. $\square$

Lemma 3.4.10. *Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation such that $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}} = \bar{r}|_{G_{F_{\tilde{v}}}}$ is semisimple and 6-generic at all places $\tilde{v}|p$. If $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{r})$ has defect δ then there are tame types $\tau = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ and $\tau' = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau'_v$ such that*

$$(1) \quad \sigma \in W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau}) \subset W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau}');$$

- (2) $\#W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) = 2^\delta$ and $\#W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}') = 2^{\delta+1}$;
- (3) all Serre weights in $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau})$ and $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}')$ have defect at most δ and if $\delta > 0$, σ is the unique Serre weight in $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}')$ with defect δ ;
- (4) If $\delta = 0$, given any Serre weight adjacent to σ , one can choose the τ' as above so that $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}')$ contains exactly these two weights;
- (5) The hypotheses of Corollary 3.4.9 are satisfied by $\bar{\tau}$ and τ (or τ') as in Lemma 3.4.10.

Proof. This is essentially a direct consequence of results in §2.1.

Let us fix a place $\tilde{v} \mid p$ and write $V(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}|_{I_{\tilde{v}}}) = R_s(\mu + \underline{1})$ (note that $s \in W(\underline{G})$ and $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ depend on $\tilde{v}$; we omit it not to overload notation) and label $W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}})$ by $r(\Sigma)$ as in Proposition 2.2.6. Corollary 2.2.13 says that for any $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_j) \in \widetilde{W}$ with $\tilde{w}_j \in \text{Adm}^+(\eta)$ and $\tau_v = R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu)$,

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \bar{\tau}_v) = \{\sigma_{r(\omega, a)} : r(\omega, a) \in \prod_j r(\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j})\}$$

where $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$ is defined in Table 4. Let $\sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}})$ have defect zero (cf. Definition 2.1). Then there is an element $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_j) \in \widetilde{W}$ with $\ell(\tilde{w}_j) = 4$ such that, by letting $\tau_v = R_{s\tilde{w}}(\mu)$, one has $W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \bar{\tau}_v) = \{\sigma_v\}$. When $(\omega_j, a_j) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{inn}}$ there is an length 3 element $\tilde{w}_j \in \{\alpha\beta\alpha, \beta\gamma\beta, \alpha\gamma\alpha\}$ such that $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$ contains exactly $\{(\omega_j, a_j), r(\omega_j, a_j)\}$.

Thus, we can construct a type $\tau = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ such that $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) = 2^\delta$ where all weights have defect at most δ .

To construct τ' satisfying (2) and (3) we proceed similarly (in particular, we fix $\tilde{v} \mid p$ and work embeddingwise). Following the strategy above, for each j such that $\ell(\tilde{w}_j) = 3$, consider any $\tilde{w}'_j \leq \tilde{w}_j$ of length 2. Then

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{w}'_j} \subset \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$$

and has size 4 (see Table 4). Furthermore, $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}'_j} \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j} \subset \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$.

Finally, there are six pairs $\{(\omega_j, a_j), (\omega'_j, a'_j)\} \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$ which are adjacent in the Table 2 each of which appears as $\Sigma_{\tilde{w}_j}$ for a length three element $\tilde{w}_j$. This gives the type satisfying (4). $\square$

Lemma 3.4.11. *Let $\bar{\tau} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation such that $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}} = \bar{\tau}|_{G_{F_{\tilde{v}}}}$ is semisimple and 6-generic at all places $\tilde{v} \mid p$. If there exists $\sigma \in W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{\tau})$ with defect 0, then for all $\sigma' \in W^?(\bar{\tau})$, $e(M_\infty(\sigma')) = 1$. In particular, $W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{\tau}) = W^?(\bar{\tau})$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $W^?(\bar{\tau}) \subset W_t^{\text{BM}}(\bar{\tau})$. We first prove the lemma assuming σ' has defect 0 by induction on the distance from σ . By Lemma 3.4.10(2), one can choose a tame type τ such that $W^?(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) = \{\sigma\}$. Then $e(M_\infty(\sigma)) = 1$ by Lemma 3.4.8 and Corollary 3.4.9. This establishes the distance 0 case.

Suppose that $\sigma' \in W^\tau(\bar{\tau})$ has defect 0 and distance $d > 0$ from σ . Then there is a $\sigma'' \in W^\tau(\bar{\tau})$ adjacent to σ' , with defect 0, and of distance $d - 1$ from σ . We choose a type τ' as in Lemma 3.4.104 for the adjacent weights σ' and σ'' . Then by inductive hypothesis $M_\infty(\sigma'')$ and hence $M_\infty((\tau')^\circ)$ is nonzero (for any choice of a $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice $(\tau')^\circ$ in τ'). By Lemma 3.4.8 and Corollary 3.4.9, $e(M_\infty((\tau')^\circ)) = 2$. By Proposition 3.4.7, we deduce that $e(M_\infty(\sigma')) = 1$.

We now prove the general case of the lemma by induction on the defect. Suppose that $\sigma' \in W^\tau(\bar{\tau})$ has defect $\delta > 0$. We choose τ as in Lemma 3.4.10 (and an $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice τ° in it) taking σ to be σ' . By Lemma 3.4.10(2) and (3), $W^\tau(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau})$ contains a weight of lower defect. By the inductive hypothesis, $M_\infty(\bar{\tau}^\circ)$ is nonzero. By Lemma 3.4.8 and Corollary 3.4.9, $e(M_\infty(\bar{\tau}^\circ)) = 2^\delta$. By Lemma 3.4.10(3) and induction, $e(M_\infty(\bar{\tau}^\circ)) - e(M_\infty(\sigma'))$ is the number of weights in $W^\tau(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau}) \setminus \{\sigma'\}$, which is $2^\delta - 1$. We conclude that $e(M_\infty(\sigma')) = 1$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4.12. *Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation such that $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}} = \bar{r}|_{G_{F_{\tilde{v}}}}$ is semisimple and 6-generic at all places $\tilde{v}|p$. If $\sigma \in W_t^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r})$ has defect $\delta > 0$, then there exists $\sigma' \in W_t^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r})$ with defect less than δ .*

Proof. Choose τ and τ' as in Lemma 3.4.10 and fix lattices τ° and $(\tau')^\circ$ in it. Then $M_\infty(\tau^\circ)$ and $M_\infty((\tau')^\circ)$ are nonzero. Hence by Lemmas 3.4.8 and 3.4.10(2) and Corollary 3.4.9, $e(M_\infty((\tau')^\circ)) - e(M_\infty(\tau^\circ)) = 2^\delta$. By Proposition 3.4.7 and Proposition 3.4.10(1), $e(M_\infty((\tau')^\circ)) - e(M_\infty(\tau^\circ))$ is the sum of the multiplicities of $M_\infty(\sigma')$ as σ' runs over the Serre weights in $W^\tau(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau}') \setminus W^\tau(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$. By Lemma 3.4.10(3), the Serre weights in $W^\tau(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau}') \setminus W^\tau(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$ have defect less than δ . We conclude that there must be a Serre weight $\sigma' \in W_t^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r})$ of defect less than δ . $\square$

Proof of 3.4.3. By assumption, there is a Serre weight $\sigma \in W_t^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r})$. By induction on the defect using Lemma 3.4.12, we can assume without loss of generality that the defect of σ is 0. The theorem now follows from Lemma 3.4.11. $\square$

Proof of 3.4.5. After Lemma 3.32, the only remaining cases are when $\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$ contains components of length less than 2. In these cases, we constructed a candidate $\tilde{R}$ for (a formally smooth cover) of the special fiber of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)}/\varpi$ in §8 of [LLHLM]. Theorem 3.4.3 gives a lower bound on the number of components of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)}/\varpi$. The same argument as in Proposition 8.4 of *loc. cit.* shows that the candidate is in fact correct and that the components of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)}/\varpi$ are in bijection with $W^\tau(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})$. $\square$

We use a setup similar to that in Section 7 of [LLHLM]. Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be an automorphic Galois representation that satisfies the Taylor–Wiles conditions in the sense of Definition 7.3 of [LLHLM]. Assume furthermore that

- the extension F/F^+ is unramified at all finite places;
- If $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is ramified at a place w of F , then $v = w|_{F^+}$ splits as ww^c (split ramification); and
- p is unramified in F^+ .

Note that a weak patching functor M_∞ which satisfies the conditions of [LLHLM, Definition 7.11] exists, which we now fix, by Proposition 7.15 of [LLHLM]. Define $W(\bar{r})$ as in Definition 7.1 of [LLHLM]. We have the following version of the weight part of Serre's conjecture.

Theorem 3.4.13. *Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a continuous Galois representation, satisfying the Taylor-Wiles conditions. Assume that $\bar{r}|_{G_{F_v}}$ is semisimple and 6-generic for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, that $\bar{r}$ is automorphic, and that $\bar{r}$ has split ramification outside p . Then $W(\bar{r}) = W^?(\bar{r})$.*

Proof. We have that $W^{\mathrm{BM}}(\bar{r}) = W(\bar{r})$ by [LLHLM, Definition 7.11(2)]. The result now follows from Theorem 3.4.3. $\square$

In exactly the same way as in [LLHLM, §8], we can use Theorem 3.4.13 to deduce:

Theorem 3.4.14. *Let $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$ be a finite unramified extension. Let $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be a continuous Galois representation which is semisimple and 6-generic, and let τ be a tame inertial type. Then the framed potentially crystalline deformation ring $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{(2,1,0),\tau}$ with Hodge-Tate weights $(2,1,0)^f$ has connected generic fiber.*

3.5. The geometric Breuil-Mézard conjecture. We now show that weak minimal patching functors can be used to assign components in deformation rings to Serre weights.

Proposition 3.5.1. *Let $\bar{\rho}$ be as in Theorem 3.4.14.*

- (1) *There is a unique assignment $\sigma \mapsto \mathfrak{p}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho})$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma) \subset R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$ is a prime ideal and*

$$(3.4) \quad \mathrm{Spec}(\bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}}^\tau) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)} \mathrm{Spec}(R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square / \mathfrak{p}(\sigma))$$

for any type τ . Moreover, the image of $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)$ in $\bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}}^\tau$ is a minimal prime ideal.

- (2) *If M_∞ is a weak minimal patching functor, then the scheme-theoretic support of $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)$ is $\mathrm{Spec}(R_\infty / \sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\sigma_v) R_\infty)$.*

Proof. We first prove uniqueness. Suppose there is such an assignment. This very closely follows the procedure of induction on the defect with respect to $W^?(\bar{\rho})$ in the proof of Theorem 3.4.3. If the defect of $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho})$ is 0, then there exists a type τ such that $W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$ has one element by

Lemma 3.4.10. Then we must have $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma) = \text{Ann}_{R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}} \bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}}^{\tau}$. If the defect of σ is $\delta > 0$, then choose a type τ as in Lemma 3.4.10. Then by induction and Lemma 3.4.10(3), there is a unique component of $\text{Spec}(\bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}}^{\tau})$ whose defining ideal is not $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma')$ for some $\sigma' \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})$ of lower defect. Then $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)$ must be this defining ideal.

We now show existence of an assignment. We choose a suitable globalization $\bar{\tau}$ of $\bar{\rho}$ in the sense of [EG14, Appendix A]. By [LLHLM, Proposition 7.15] a weak patching functor M_{∞} , which we now fix, exists. Fix a place $v' \in \Sigma_p^+$. For $v \neq v'$, we choose types $\tau_{\bar{v}}$ such that $\ell((\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{\bar{v}}, \bar{\tau}_v))_i) = 4$ for all $i = 0, \dots, f_{v'}$. For a weight $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{v'})$, we choose a type $\tau_{v'}$ such that $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_{v'})$. Since $R_{\infty}(\tau)$ is formally smooth over $\hat{\otimes}_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}}$, there is a bijection between the minimal prime ideals of $\bar{R}_{\infty}(\tau)$, the minimal prime ideals of $\hat{\otimes}_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}}$, and a tuple of minimal prime ideals in $\bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}}$ for each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. For each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, we fix a lattice τ_v° in τ_v . Since $e(M_{\infty}(\sigma \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+, v \neq v'} \bar{\tau}_v^{\circ})) = 1$ by Theorem 3.4.3, $\text{Supp}_{R_{\infty}} M_{\infty}(\sigma \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+, v \neq v'} \bar{\tau}_v^{\circ}) = \{\mathfrak{p}'(\sigma) R_{\infty} + \sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+, v \neq v'} \mathfrak{p}_v R_{\infty}\}$ for some prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}'(\sigma) \subset R_{\bar{\rho}_{v'}}^{\square}$ where $\mathfrak{p}_v \subset R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\square}$ is the (prime) ideal defining $R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}}$.

Then, we claim that $\sigma \mapsto \mathfrak{p}'(\sigma)$ is an assignment satisfying (3.4) for every $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. Indeed, since the generic fiber of $\bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}}$ is connected by 3.4.14, $\text{Spec} \bar{R}_{\infty}(\tau)$ is the scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\bar{\tau}^{\circ})$. The scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\bar{\tau}^{\circ})$ is generically reduced without embedded components with underlying reduced structure

$$(3.5) \quad \bigcup_{\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})} \text{Spec} (R_{\infty} / (\mathfrak{p}'(\sigma) R_{\infty} + \sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+, v \neq v'} \mathfrak{p}_v R_{\infty})).$$

Hence the scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\bar{\tau}^{\circ})$ must coincide with (3.5). We conclude that (3.4) holds for the assignment $\mathfrak{p}'$.

We now show part (2). Suppose that M_{∞} is a weak minimal patching functor for $\bar{\tau}$. Let $\sigma = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\tau})$. Since $e(M_{\infty}(\sigma \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+, v \neq v'} \bar{\tau}_v^{\circ})) = 1$, by the argument of the last paragraph, the scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\sigma)$ is $R_{\infty} / (\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\sigma)_v R_{\infty})$ for some prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)_v \in R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\square}$. We will show that $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)_v = \mathfrak{p}(\sigma_v)$, where $\mathfrak{p}$ is the assignment in part 1.

We induct on $\delta = \sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \text{Def}(\sigma_v)$. If $\delta = 0$, then for any place $v' \in \Sigma_p^+$, one can choose types $\tau_{\bar{v}}$ for $v \neq v'$ as in the last paragraph. Then one can show that $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)_{v'}$ is an assignment as in the last paragraph, and so $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma)_v = \mathfrak{p}(\sigma_v)$ for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. Suppose that $\delta > 0$. Choose a type τ as in Lemma 3.4.10. Then by the inductive hypothesis, for any weight $\sigma' = \bigotimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v \in W^?(\bar{\tau})$ with $\sigma' \not\cong \sigma$, the scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\sigma')$ is $R_{\infty} / (\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\sigma'_v) R_{\infty})$. Since the generic fiber of $\text{Spf}(\hat{\otimes}_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_v}^{\tau_{\bar{v}}})$ is connected by 3.4.14, the scheme-theoretic support of $M_{\infty}(\tau)$ is

$$(3.6) \quad \bigcup_{\sigma' \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})} \text{Spec} (R_{\infty} / (\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\sigma'_v) R_{\infty})).$$

From this, we see that since $e(M_\infty(\sigma)) = 1$, the scheme-theoretic support of $M_\infty(\sigma)$ is forced to be $\text{Spec } R_\infty / (\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\sigma_v) R_\infty)$. $\square$

We have the following refinement of Proposition 3.5.1(2).

Lemma 3.5.2. *Let V be a multiplicity free, p -torsion $\prod_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} K_v$ -representation. Define the closed subscheme $\overline{X}_\infty(V) \hookrightarrow \overline{X}_\infty$ to be the reduced subscheme underlying $\bigcup_{\sigma \in \text{JH}(V)} \text{Supp}(M_\infty(\sigma))$. Then the scheme-theoretic support of $M_\infty(V)$ is $\overline{X}_\infty(V)$. In particular if $M_\infty(V)$ is a cyclic R_∞ -module, then $M_\infty(V) \cong R_\infty / I(V)$ where*

$$I(V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{\sigma \in \text{JH}(V)} \text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(\sigma)).$$

Proof. The proof is contained in the proof of [EGS15, Proposition 8.1.1]. The scheme-theoretic support is generically reduced and the Cohen–Macaulay property guarantees that there are no embedded primes. Hence the scheme-theoretic support is reduced. $\square$

3.5.1. Matching components. In Proposition 3.5.1, we saw that the components of the special fiber of the potentially crystalline deformation ring $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{(2,1,0),\tau}/\varpi$ are in bijection with a subset $W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$ of modular weights. In this subsection, we explicitly describe the corresponding prime ideals in $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$. This can be compared to Theorem 7.2.1(4) [EGS15]. However, for GL_2 , all the components were the special fibers of Fontaine–Laffaille deformations rings. This is far from the case in our setting.

Instead of using Fontaine–Laffaille theory, we compare the special fibers of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{(2,1,0),\tau}/\varpi$ for different τ to label components. Rather than dealing with all possible cases, we restrict ourselves to the cases that we will need to prove Theorem 5.2.1.

We begin with some preliminaries on deformation spaces and Kisin modules. From now on, $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F})$ is a fixed semisimple Galois representation, which is moreover 6-generic.

If τ is a 3-generic type, we write $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ for the unique Kisin module with descent datum of type τ and such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})|_{G_{K_\infty}} \cong \bar{\rho}$. In this case, the shape $\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w} = (\tilde{w}_0, \dots, \tilde{w}_{f-1}) \in \widetilde{W}_a$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is uniquely determined.

Recall from [LLHLM], §5.3 and §8 that we have certain explicit $\mathbb{F}$ -algebras $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ together with a diagram

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \text{Spf}(\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \bar{\rho}}^{\tau, \bar{\beta}, \square}) & \\ f.s. \swarrow & & \searrow f.s. \\ \text{Spf}(\overline{R}_{\bar{\rho}}^{(2,1,0),\tau}) & & \text{Spf}(\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}) \end{array}$$

where the arrows are formally smooth morphisms (cf. [LLHLM], §5 for the precise definition of the deformation rings $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \overline{\rho}}^{\tau, \overline{\beta}, \square}$ and $\overline{R}_{\overline{\rho}}^{(2, 1, 0), \tau}$). Recall that $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \in Y^{(2, 1, 0), \tau}(\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla})$ is the standard notation for the universal Kisin module (with gauge basis) for shape $\mathbf{w}$. We write $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} := (\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}}[1/u])^{\Delta=1}$ for the associated étale φ -module as in §3.1.

From now on, we further fix a 3-generic type $\tau = \tau(s_\tau, -\mu)$. Since we always work with framed Galois deformation with parallel Hodge–Tate weights $(2, 1, 0)$, we omit the Hodge type from the notation, and write $\overline{R}_{\overline{\rho}}^\tau := \overline{R}_{\overline{\rho}}^{(2, 1, 0), \tau}$. Recall from [LLHLM], §5.3 the product structure $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} = \widehat{\bigotimes}_j \overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ where the explicit presentation of $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ is given in *loc. cit.*, Table 6 (if $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j \notin \{\text{id}, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$) and §8 (else).

By Proposition 3.3.8,

$$W^2(\overline{\rho}, \tau) = \prod_j \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^*}.$$

It is natural to expect that these two product structures match. To see this, we can work inductively one embedding at a time. Fix i with $0 \leq i \leq f-1$.

The strategy will be as follows. Choose $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*}$. If $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is obvious in embedding i for $\overline{\rho}$ (see Definition 2.2.5) then there exists a type $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ such that

$$(3.8) \quad W^2(\overline{\rho}, \tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}) = \prod_{j \neq i} \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^*} \times \{(\omega_i, a_i)\} \subset W^2(\overline{\rho}, \tau)$$

Similarly, if $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is a shadow in embedding i for $\overline{\rho}$ then there exists a type $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad W^2(\overline{\rho}, \tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}) = \prod_{j \neq i} \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^*} \times \{(\omega_i, 0), (\omega_i, 1)\} \subset W^2(\overline{\rho}, \tau)$$

(For the claims above, cf. Proposition 3.5.3.)

The first step is to determine the type $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$. Recall from Proposition 3.3.6 that if s is the orientation of τ , then we can express the K -type $\tau = R_{s_\tau, \mu}^*(s^*(\mu))$ where $s_{\tau, \mu}^* = s^* s_\tau F(s^*)^{-1} \in W(\underline{G})$ is as in (3.1).

For $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*}$, the condition that (ω_i, a_i) is obvious for $\overline{\rho}$ in embedding i is equivalent to $(\omega_i, a_i) = (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*(\omega'_i), r(a'_i))$ for $(\omega'_i, a'_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$. For any $(\omega'_i, a'_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$, there is a permutation s' such that $t_{s'(\eta)}(r(\Sigma_0)) \cap \Sigma_0$ is exactly (ω'_i, a'_i) .

Similarly, the condition that $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is a shadow weight for $\overline{\rho}$ in embedding i implies that $a_i = 1$ and $\{(\omega_i, 0), (\omega_i, 1)\} \subseteq \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*}$. Again, this is equivalent to $(\omega_i, a_i) = (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*(\omega'_i), r(a'_i))$ for $(\omega'_i, a'_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{inn}}$. Note that in this case we actually have $\omega'_i = \omega_i$. For any $(\omega'_i, a'_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{inn}}$, there is a length three, shadow shape $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_s$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_s(r(\Sigma_0)) \cap \Sigma_0$ is exactly $\{(\omega_i, 0), (\omega_i, 1)\}$.

Proposition 3.5.3. *Keep the notations above and fix $0 \leq i \leq f-1$. Let $\overline{\rho}$ be semisimple of shape $\mathbf{w}(\overline{\rho}, \tau)$, let $(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^*}$ and define the element $z^* \in \widehat{W}_a$ by $z_j^* = \text{id}$ for $j \neq i$ and $z_i^* = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^* t_{s'(\eta)}$*

(resp. $z_i^* = \tilde{w}_i^* \tilde{w}_s$) if (ω_i, a_i) is obvious (resp. shadow weight) in embedding i for $\bar{\rho}$. Then the type $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ defined by

$$\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)} := R_{s_{\tau, \mu}^*}^{s^*} (s^*(\mu))$$

verifies the condition (3.8) (resp. the condition (3.9)).

Proof. In what follows we write $\mathbf{w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$. By Proposition 2.2.9 and 3.3.7 we have

$$W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}) = F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_{s^* \mu}(s_{\tau, \mu}^* \mathbf{w}^*(r\Sigma))) \cap F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_{s^* \mu}(s_{\tau, \mu}^* z^*(\Sigma))).$$

By the genericity hypothesis on μ , for any $(2, 1, 0)$ -admissible element $\mathbf{w}' \in \widetilde{W}^f$, the maps $\Sigma \rightarrow F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_{s^* \mu}(s_{\tau, \mu}^* \mathbf{w}'(r\Sigma)))$, $\Sigma \rightarrow F(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{r}_{s^* \mu}(s_{\tau, \mu}^* \mathbf{w}'(\Sigma)))$ are injective.

By injectivity, and since $z_j^* = \text{id}$ for all $j \neq i$, it suffices to show that $\tilde{w}_i^*(r(\Sigma_0)) \cap z_i^*(\Sigma_0) = \{(\omega_i, a_i)\}$ when (ω_i, a_i) is obvious for $\bar{\rho}$ (resp. $\tilde{w}_i^*(r(\Sigma_0)) \cap z_i^*(\Sigma_0) = \{(\omega_i, 1), (\omega_i, 0)\}$ when (ω_i, a_i) is a shadow for $\bar{\rho}$).

Since we chose $(\omega'_i, a'_i) \in \Sigma_0^{\text{obv}}$ and $t_{s'(\eta)}$ (resp. $\tilde{w}_s$) in such a way that $\tilde{w}_i^*(\omega'_i, r(a'_i)) = (\omega_i, a_i)$ and $(\omega'_i, r(a'_i)) = r(\Sigma_0) \cap t_{s'(\eta)}(\Sigma_0)$ (resp. $\{(\omega_i, 0), (\omega_i, 1)\} = r(\Sigma_0) \cap \tilde{w}_s(\Sigma_0)$) the conclusion follows. $\square$

In the remainder of the section, we show how we can identify the universal family for types $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ (according to the defect for $\bar{\rho}$) inside the family of type τ , in various examples. Define $\tilde{w}'_j = \tilde{w}_j$ for $j \neq f-1-i$ and $\tilde{w}'_{f-1-i} = t_{s'(\eta)}$ if $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is obvious for $\bar{\rho}$ at embedding i (resp. $\tilde{w}'_{f-1-i} = \tilde{w}_s$ if $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is shadow for $\bar{\rho}$ at embedding i) and set $\mathbf{w}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tilde{w}'_0, \dots, \tilde{w}'_{f-1})$. Explicitly we show that when $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is obvious at i , we have

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{w}', \tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}}^{\text{univ}} \cong \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$$

where $\mathfrak{c}_{\omega_i, a_i}$ is an explicit ideal of an irreducible component of $R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$; we have a similar claim when $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is shadow at i , where we now use an explicit ideal $\mathfrak{w}_{\omega_i}$ corresponding to a pair of components of $R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ (corresponding to constituents of a length two Weyl module). In principle, it is possible to do this in many other cases as well. Allowing ourselves to renumber embeddings, we assume $i = 0$.

Let $\mu' = (\mu'_0, \dots, \mu'_{f-1}) \in X^*(\underline{T})$ and $s'_{\tau} \in W(\text{GL}_3)$ be chosen such that $\mu'_j = \mu_j$ for $j \neq 0$, and μ'_0 and $s_{\tau'}$ satisfy:

$$(3.11) \quad t_{s_{f-1}(\mu'_0)} s_0^* s'_{\tau} (s_{f-1}^*)^{-1} = t_{s_{f-1}(\mu)} s_0^* s_{\tau} (s_{f-1}^*)^{-1} z_0^*.$$

By writing $z_{f-1} = \sigma t_{\nu}$, the condition above is satisfied by letting $s'_{\tau} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_{\tau} (s_{f-1}^*)^{-1} \sigma^{-1} s_{f-1}^*$ and $\mu'_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu_0 + t_{(s_{\tau} (s_{f-1}^*)^{-1})(\nu)}$.

Lemma 3.5.4. *For μ' and s'_τ as above and $i = 0$ and z_0^* as in Proposition 3.5.3, we have*

$$\tau(s'_\tau, -\mu') = \tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$$

Proposition 3.5.5. *Let $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}', \tau(\omega_i, a_i)}^{\text{univ}}$ be as above such that Frobenius is given by $(A_1^{(j)})_j$ and $i = 0$. Consider the Kisin module $\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i))$ with descent datum of type τ over $\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{w}'}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ satisfying*

$$A_2^{(f-1)} := A_1^{(f-1)} z_{f-1}, \quad A_2^{(j)} := A_1^{(j)} \text{ for } j \neq f-1.$$

Then, $(\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i)))[1/u]^{\Delta=1} \cong (\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}', \tau(\omega_i, a_i)}^{\text{univ}})[1/u]^{\Delta=1}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.5.3, we can write $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)} = \tau(s'_\tau, -\mu')$ where μ'_{f-1} differs from μ_{f-1} by a small weight. By genericity hypotheses on μ , the orientation of μ' is the same as the orientation of μ' .

By Corollary 3.1.3, there exists a basis $(\mathfrak{f}^{(j)})$ of $\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}', \tau(\omega_i, a_i)}^{\text{univ}})[1/u]^{\Delta=1}$ such that

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}) = A_1^{(j)} (s'_{j+1})^{-1} s'_j v^{s'_j(\mu'_{f-1-j})}$$

where $s'_j = s_j$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ and $s'_f = s'_\tau s_0$. Similarly, we have a basis $(\mathfrak{f}^{(j)})$ of $\mathcal{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i)))[1/u]^{\Delta=1}$ such that

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi_{\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i))}^{(j)}) = A_2^{(j)} (s_{j+1})^{-1} s_j v^{s_j(\mu_{f-1-j})}$$

where $s_f = s_\tau s_0$.

We claim that the matrices match exactly. This immediately reduces to the identity

$$(3.12) \quad (s'_f)^{-1} s_{f-1} v^{s_{f-1}(\mu'_0)} = z_{f-1} s_f^{-1} s_{f-1} v^{s_{f-1}(\mu)}.$$

Applying $(\cdot)^*$, (3.12) is equivalent to (3.11) and so follows from Lemma 3.5.4. $\square$

In Proposition 3.5.5, we produce a family of Kisin module of type τ which matches the universal family of type $\tau_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$. To match components as in (3.10) we distinguish two steps. We first show that for any (ω_i, a_i) such that $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is obvious for $\bar{\rho}$ at embedding i , there is an ideal $\mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ of $\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ (corresponding to an irreducible component), such that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_i, a_i)} \cong \mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_i, a_i)).$$

We then show that when $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ is shadow for $\bar{\rho}$ at embedding i , there exists an ideal $\mathfrak{w}_i$, cutting out two irreducible components for $\text{Spec}(\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla})$, one and only one of which has been identified by the first process.

This is straightforward using the relations in Proposition 3.5.5, and therefore we obtain a bijection

$$(3.13) \quad \prod_{i=0}^{f-1} \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_i^*} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Irr}(\text{Spec}(\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Irr}(\overline{X}_{\overline{\rho}}^{\tau})$$

$$(3.14) \quad (\omega, a) \mapsto \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} \mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_{f-1-i}, a_{f-1-i})} = \mathfrak{p}(\sigma_{(\omega, a)})$$

where $\text{Irr}(\bullet)$ denotes the set of irreducible components and $\mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$ are certain explicit ideals (cf. Table 6 for those which will be needed in section 5.2).

The results are summarized in the table below and sample computations are given in the next subsection.

TABLE 6

$\tilde{w}_i$	$(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_i^*}$	ω'_i	$t_{s'(\eta)}$	z_i^*	z_{f-1-i}	$\mathfrak{c}_{(\omega_i, a_i)}$
$\alpha\beta$	$(\omega_1, 1)$	$\omega_2 - \omega_1$	$\alpha\beta\gamma^+\beta = t_{(-1,1,0)}$	$\gamma\beta$	$t_{(-1,1,0)}(123)$	$\mathfrak{u}_1 = (c_{12}, c_{31})$
	$(\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0)$	ω_2	$\alpha\gamma^+\alpha\beta = t_{(0,1,-1)}$	$\beta\gamma\alpha\beta$	$t_{(0,1,-1)}(123)$	$\mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{12}, c_{22})$
	$(\underline{0}, 0)$	$\underline{0}$	$\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma^+ = t_{(-1,0,1)}$	$\alpha\gamma$	$t_{(-1,0,1)}(123)$	$\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{31}, c'_{33})$
α	$(\omega_1, 1)$	$\omega_2 - \omega_1$	$\alpha\beta\gamma^+\beta = t_{(-1,1,0)}$	$\beta\gamma\beta$	$t_{(-1,1,0)}(12)$	$\mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}} = (c_{11}, c_{13}, c_{31})$
	$(\omega_2, 0)$	ω_2	$\alpha\gamma^+\alpha\beta = t_{(0,1,-1)}$	$\gamma\alpha\beta$	$t_{(0,1,-1)}(12)$	$\mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{11}, c_{31}, \tilde{c}_{32})$
	$(\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0)$	ω_1	$\beta\gamma^+\beta\alpha = t_{(1,-1,0)}$	$\alpha\beta\gamma\beta\alpha$	$t_{(1,-1,0)}(12)$	$\mathfrak{l}_{\text{ob}} = (c_{23}, c'_{22}, \tilde{c}_{32})$
	$(\underline{0}, 0)$	$\underline{0}$	$\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma^+ = t_{(-1,0,1)}$	$\beta\alpha\gamma$	$t_{(1,0,-1)}(12)$	$\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{11}, c_{13}, c_{23})$
id	$(\omega_1, 0)$	ω_1	$\beta\gamma^+\beta\alpha = t_{(1,-1,0)}$	$\beta\gamma\beta\alpha$	$t_{(1,-1,0)}$	$\mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{ii}, i = 1, 2, 3, c_{21}, c_{31}, c_{23})$
	$(\omega_2, 0)$	ω_2	$\alpha\gamma^+\alpha\beta = t_{(0,1,-1)}$	$\alpha\gamma\alpha\beta$	$t_{(0,1,-1)}$	$\mathfrak{l}_3 = (c_{ii}, i = 1, 2, 3, c_{12}, c_{31}, c_{32})$
	$(\underline{0}, 0)$	$\underline{0}$	$\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma^+ = t_{(-1,0,1)}$	$\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma$	$t_{(-1,0,1)}$	$\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{ii}, i = 1, 2, 3, c_{13}, c_{23}, c_{12})$
$\tilde{w}_i$	$(\omega_i, a_i) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{w}_i^*}$	$\tilde{w}_s = z_i^*$	$\mathfrak{w}_{\omega_i}$			
id	$(\omega_1, 1)$	$\beta\gamma^+\beta$	$\mathfrak{w}_2 = (c_{33}, c_{11}, c_{31}, c_{23} - c_{21}c_{13})$			
	$(\omega_2, 1)$	$\alpha\gamma^+\alpha$	$\mathfrak{w}_3 = (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{12}, c_{31} - c_{32}c_{21})$			
	$(\underline{0}, 1)$	$\alpha\beta\alpha$	$\mathfrak{w}_1 = (c_{22}, c_{33}, c_{23}, c_{12} - c_{13}c_{32})$			

We record the following lemma, which follows from Table 6, for future use. Let $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$. Suppose that $\ell(\tilde{w}_i) \geq 2$ for all $0 \leq i \leq f-1$. Let $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i (4 - \ell(\tilde{w}_i))$, and $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\otimes}_{j=1}^N \mathcal{O}[[x_j, y_j]] / (x_j y_j - p)$. By [LLHLM, §5.3.2], there exists a formally smooth map $R \rightarrow R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$, which we fix. We think of R as a subalgebra of $R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$. For $\sigma \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$, let $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{expl}}(\sigma) \subset R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ be the prime ideal corresponding to the weight σ . The minimal prime ideals of $R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ containing ϖ are of the

form $((z_j)_{j=1}^N + (\varpi))R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ where $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$. Define $z_j(\sigma)$ so that $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{expl}}(\sigma) = ((z_j(\sigma))_{j=1}^N + (\varpi))R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$.

Lemma 3.5.6. *For σ_1 and $\sigma_2 \in W^?(\overline{\rho}, \tau)$,*

$$\#(\{z_j(\sigma_1)\}_{j=1}^N \Delta \{z_j(\sigma_2)\}_{j=1}^N) = 2d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$$

where Δ denotes the symmetric difference.

Proof. From Table 6, one can check that if $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in W^?(\overline{\rho}, \tau)$, then $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{expl}}(\sigma_1) \cap \mathfrak{p}^{\text{expl}}(\sigma_2)$ is a prime ideal of R of height

$$d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) + 1.$$

On the other hand, the height of the intersection of $((z_j)_j + (\varpi)) \cap ((z'_j)_j + (\varpi))$ is easily seen to be

$$\frac{1}{2} \#(\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N \Delta \{z'_j\}_{j=1}^N) + 1.$$

□

3.5.2. Change of shape. For convenience, we list in the Table 7 the length 4 shapes and their universal families over $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_j}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$:

3.5.3. The $\alpha\beta$ -cell. Assume that $\tilde{w}_{f-1} = \alpha\beta$. The universal $\alpha\beta$ shape over $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \alpha\beta}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{31}c_{12}(c_{32}^*)^{-1} & c_{12} & c_{13} + vc_{13}^* \\ vc_{21}^* & c_{22} & c_{23} + vc_{23}' \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32}^* & (c_{31}c_{23}(c_{21}^*)^{-1} + vc_{33}') \end{pmatrix}$$

with conditions

$$\begin{aligned} c_{22}c_{31} &= 0; & c_{12}c_{23} &= c_{22}c_{13}; \\ c_{32}^*c_{13} - c_{33}'c_{12} &= 0; & & \text{(determinant)} \\ c_{12}((b-c)c_{33}'c_{21}^* + (a-b)c_{31}c_{23}') &= 0. & & \text{(monodromy)} \end{aligned}$$

From characteristic zero, the monodromy condition further yields the equation:

$$(-1 - a + c)c_{23}c_{32}^* = (-1 - a + b)c_{22}c_{33}'.$$

The minimal primes of $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \alpha\beta}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ are

$$\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{12}, c_{22}); \quad \mathfrak{u}_1 = (c_{12}, c_{31}); \quad \mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{31}, c_{33}') \quad \mathfrak{u}_2 = (c_{22}, c_{33}')$$

TABLE 7. Deforming $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ by shape (with monodromy, modulo p)

$\tilde{w}_j$	$\overline{A}_{\tilde{w}_j}^{(j)}$	$\tilde{w}_j$	$\overline{A}_{\tilde{w}_j}^{(j)}$
$\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma$	$\begin{pmatrix} v^2b_{11}^* & 0 & 0 \\ v^2b_{21} & vb_{22}^* & 0 \\ v^2b_{31}' & vb_{32} & b_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$	$\beta\gamma\alpha\gamma$	$\begin{pmatrix} vb_{11}^* & vb_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & v^2b_{22}^* & 0 \\ vb_{31} & vb_{32} + v^2b_{32}' & b_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$ $(e - (b' - c'))b_{32}b_{11}^* - (e - (a' - c'))b_{12}b_{31} = 0$
$\beta\gamma\beta\alpha$	$\begin{pmatrix} b_{11}^* & vb_{12}' & b_{13} \\ 0 & v^2b_{22}^* & 0 \\ 0 & v^2b_{32} & vb_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$	$\gamma\alpha\beta\alpha$	$\begin{pmatrix} b_{11}^* & b_{12} & b_{13} + vb_{13}' \\ 0 & vb_{22}^* & vb_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & v^2b_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$ $(a' - b')b_{13}b_{22}^* - (a' - b')b_{23}b_{12} = 0$
$\alpha\gamma\alpha\beta$	$\begin{pmatrix} vb_{11}^* & 0 & vb_{13} \\ vb_{12} & b_{22}^* & vb_{23}' \\ 0 & 0 & v^2b_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$	$\alpha\beta\gamma\beta$	$\begin{pmatrix} v^2b_{11}^* & 0 & 0 \\ v(b_{21} + vb_{21}') & b_{22}^* & b_{23} \\ v^2b_{31} & 0 & vb_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$ $(e - (a' - b'))b_{21}b_{33}^* - (b' - c')b_{31}b_{23} = 0$

The matrices describe the mod p -reduction of the universal Kisin modules with shape of maximal length. On the right column the equation is obtained from the monodromy condition on the universal Kisin module.

We provide details for the matching of the ideal $\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{12}, c_{22})$ in Table 6. First of all, from the determinant and the monodromy condition, we see that

$$\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1 = \overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / (c_{12}, c_{22}, c_{13}, c_{23}).$$

Hence, the Frobenius action on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w},\tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1$ at the $(f-1)$ -th embedding is characterized by

$$A_{\alpha\beta}^{(f-1)} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & vc_{13}^* \\ vc_{21}^* & 0 & vc_{23}' \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32}^* & vc_{33}' \end{pmatrix}$$

With $z_{f-1} = t_{(-1,1,0)}(123)$, we immediately deduce that

$$\left(A_{\alpha\beta}^{(f-1)} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1 \right) (132) = A_{\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma}^{(f-1)} v^{(-1,1,0)}.$$

The conclusion follows from Proposition 3.5.5 since $\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (0,0)) = \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w},\tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1$.

The matching with the $\mathfrak{u}_1$ and $\mathfrak{l}_2$ -components are performed in the similar fashion.

3.5.4. *The α -cell.* We consider the α -cell modulo p :

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} + vc_{12}^* & c_{13} \\ vc_{21}^* & c_{22} + vc_{22}' & c_{23} \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32} & (c_{21}^*)^{-1}c_{31}c_{23} + vc_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

with conditions:

$$c_{31}c_{22} = 0; \quad c_{11}c_{23} = 0; \quad c_{11}c_{22} = 0;$$

$$c_{11}c_{22}'c_{33}^* + c_{13}c_{22}'c_{31} - c_{13}c_{22}'c_{31} - c_{12}c_{21}^*c_{33}^* = 0 \quad (\text{determinant});$$

$$(-1 - a + c)c_{23}(c_{32}c_{21}^* - c_{22}'c_{31}) - (-1 - a + b)c_{22}c_{33}^*c_{21}^* = 0 \quad (\text{monodromy}).$$

We now have the following four minimal primes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{l}_1 &= (c_{11}, c_{13}, c_{23}); & \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}} &= (c_{11}, c_{13}, c_{31}); \\ \mathfrak{l}_2 &= (c_{11}, c_{31}, \tilde{c}_{32}); & \mathfrak{l}_{\text{ob}} &= (c_{23}, c_{22}', \tilde{c}_{32}); \end{aligned}$$

We provide details for the component $\mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}}$. By the determinant condition we see that

$$\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}} = \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\mathbf{w}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / (c_{11}, c_{13}, c_{31}, c_{12})$$

(the monodromy equation becoming $(-1 - a + c)c_{23}c_{32} - (-1 - a + b)c_{22}c_{33}^* = 0$).

The Frobenius action on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w},\tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}}$ at the $(f-1)$ -th embedding is now characterized by

$$A_{\alpha}^{(f-1)} \otimes \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M},\tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl},\nabla} / \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & vc_{12}^* & 0 \\ vc_{21}^* & c_{22} + vc_{22}' & c_{23} \\ 0 & vc_{32} & vc_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

By choosing $z_{f-1} = t_{(-1,1,0)}(12)$, i.e. $z_0^* = \beta\gamma\beta$, we immediately deduce that

$$\left(A_\alpha^{(f-1)} \otimes R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}} \right) = A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\beta} z_{f-1}$$

The conclusion follows from Proposition 3.5.5 since $\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (\omega_1, 1)) = \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{u}_{\text{ob}}$.

The matching with the $\mathfrak{l}_1$, $\mathfrak{l}_2$ and $\mathfrak{l}_{\text{ob}}$ components are performed in the similar fashion, following column z_0^* in Table 6

3.5.5. *The id-cell.* We consider the id-cell modulo p :

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{11} + vc_{11}^* & c_{12} & c_{13} \\ vc_{21} & c_{22} + vc_{22}^* & c_{23} \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32} & c_{33} + vc_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

with height, determinant

$$c_{11}c_{22} = 0; \quad c_{11}c_{23} = 0;$$

$$c_{11}c_{33} = 0; \quad c_{12}c_{33} = 0;$$

$$c_{11}^*c_{22}c_{33} + c_{11}c_{22}^*c_{33} + c_{11}c_{22}c_{33}^* = 0$$

and monodromy conditions:

$$c_{i,1}((-1 - a + c)c_{22}^*c_{33} + (-1 - a + b)c_{22}c_{33}^* - (-1 - a + c)c_{23}c_{32}) = 0$$

$$c_{i,2}((a - b)c_{11}^*c_{33} + (-1 - b + c)c_{33}c_{11}^* - (a - b)c_{13}c_{31}) = 0$$

$$c_{i,3}((b - c)c_{11}^*c_{22} + (a - c)c_{11}c_{22}^* - (b - c)c_{12}c_{21}) = 0$$

We now have the following three minimal primes:

$$\mathfrak{l}_1 = (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{33}, c_{13}, c_{23}, c_{12}),$$

$$\mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{33}, c_{21}, c_{31}, c_{23}),$$

$$\mathfrak{l}_3 = (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{33}, c_{12}, c_{31}, c_{32}).$$

We consider the component $\mathfrak{l}_1$. We immediately see that the Frobenius action on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1$ at the $(f-1)$ -th embedding is characterized by

$$A_\alpha^{(f-1)} \otimes R_{\mathfrak{M}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} vc_{11}^* & 0 & 0 \\ vc_{21} & vc_{22}^* & 0 \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32} & vc_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

By taking $z_{f-1} = t_{(-1,0,1)}$, i.e. $z_0^* = \alpha\beta\alpha\gamma$, we have

$$\left(A_{\alpha\beta}^{(f-1)} \otimes R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_{f-1-i}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1 \right) = A_{\alpha\beta\alpha\gamma} v^{(-1,0,1)}$$

The conclusion follows from Proposition 3.5.5 since $\mathfrak{M}(\tau, (0, 0)) = \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{l}_1$. The matching for $\mathfrak{l}_2$ and $\mathfrak{l}_3$ are performed in a similar fashion.

We now consider the following primes, associated to the Weyl segments:

$$\mathfrak{w}_1 = (c_{22}, c_{33}, c_{23}, c_{12} - c_{13}c_{32})$$

$$\mathfrak{w}_2 = (c_{33}, c_{11}, c_{31}, c_{23} - c_{21}c_{13})$$

$$\mathfrak{w}_3 = (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{12}, c_{31} - c_{32}c_{21})$$

As above, the Frobenius action on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{w}, \tau}^{\text{univ}} \otimes R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{w}_1$ at the $(f-1)$ -th embedding is characterized by

$$A_{\text{id}}^{(f-1)} \otimes R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} / \mathfrak{w}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} vc_{11}^* + c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} \\ vc_{21} & vc_{22}^* & 0 \\ vc_{31} & vc_{32} & vc_{33}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

with relations

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{33}^* c_{11} - c_{13} c_{31} &= 0 \\ (a - c) c_{22}^* c_{11} - (b - c) c_{12} c_{21} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

obtained from the monodromy conditions.

Recall that in the ring $R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_{f-1}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ we have the further relation

$$c_{11} = c_{13} c_{31}$$

so that, by using $c_{12} = c_{13} c_{32}$ as well, we can rewrite (3.15) as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{33}^* c_{11} - c_{13} c_{31} &= 0 \\ c_{13} ((a - c) c_{22}^* c_{31} - (b - c) c_{32} c_{21}) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Recall now that the Frobenius action on the special fiber of shape $\alpha\beta\alpha$ and inertial type $\lambda' = (a', b', c')$ is given by

$$A_{\alpha\beta\alpha}^{(f-1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} + vb_{13}^* \\ 0 & vb_{22}^* & b_{23} \\ vb_{31}^* & vb_{32} & b_{33} + vb_{33}' \end{pmatrix}$$

with relations

$$b_{11}b_{33} = 0$$

$$b_{11}b'_{33} = b_{13}b_{31}^*$$

$$b_{11}((a' - b')b_{23}c_{32} - (a' - c')b_{22}^*b'_{33}) = 0.$$

Note that we have $b_{33} = 0$ in $A_{\alpha\beta\alpha}^{(f-1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}_p$: following [LLHLM], §5.3.1 and replacing c_{ij} with b_{ij} in the notation of *loc. cit.*, §5.3.1, we have $b_{33} = -y'_{33}b_{13}b_{31}^* = -y'_{33}b_{11}b'_{33}$ and $y'_{33}b_{11} = p$ in $\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}, \alpha\beta\alpha}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$.

By taking $z_{f-1} = (13)$, i.e. $z_0^* = \alpha\beta\alpha$, the conclusion follows.

4. LATTICES IN TYPES

The aim of this section is to carry out a classification of lattices in $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -types, providing the crucial representation-theoretic input to deduce Breuil's lattice conjecture from the weight part of Serre conjecture. The main result (Theorem 4.1.2) states that the submodule structure of lattices with irreducible cosocle can be predicted using the extension graph introduced in Section 2.

Outline of the proof. Let τ be a K -type (satisfying suitable genericity hypotheses). We have two main steps in the proof of the classification theorem: first, by local algebraic methods, we describe the reduction of lattices with irreducible cosocles isomorphic to a lower alcove weight with *defect zero* (Theorem 4.2.1). Second, in §4.3, we introduce another notion of distance related to the second part of Theorem 4.1.2, which we call *saturation distance*. It turns out that this notion is closely related to the submodule structure of the reduction of lattices.

Using a crucial global input coming from the geometry of Galois deformation rings, we show that

- (1) if measured from σ the graph and saturation distance coincide, then the reduction of the lattice with cosocle isomorphic to σ is as predicted in Theorem 4.1.2 (Proposition 4.3.10); and
- (2) measured from a lower alcove weight of defect zero, the saturation distance and the graph distance coincide (Proposition 4.3.11, which uses Theorem 4.2.1);

In contrast to the other notions of distance that we introduce, the saturation distance involves lattices in characteristic zero, making it far more flexible. Taking advantage of this flexibility, we finally show by an induction on defect that the saturation distance and the graph distance coincide, completing the proof of Theorem 4.1.2.

Structure of Section 4. For $\sigma \in \mathrm{JH}(\bar{\tau})$, let τ^σ denote the unique (up to homothety) lattice in τ with irreducible cosocle σ . The first main step is carried in section 4.2. The argument uses the modular representation theory of algebraic groups and aims at embedding $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ into the G -restriction of a tensor product $V_{\mu, \otimes}$ of algebraic Weyl modules with non p -restricted highest weight (cf. the preliminary section 4.1.1 for the precise definition of $V_{\mu, \otimes}$). The content of Section 4.2.1 is the detailed description of $V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$ provided by Theorem 4.2.2. This theorem describes the Jordan-Hölder constituents of $V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$ and the *existence of non-trivial extensions* between constituents at graph distance one (the existence of such non-trivial extensions is technical, cf. Proposition 4.2.5). The argument to embed $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ in $V_{\mu, \otimes}$ is performed in §4.2.2. One first proves the existence of a non-zero (and unique up to scalar) morphism $\bar{\tau}^\sigma \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes}$ (Proposition 4.2.7); an inductive argument, using the description of the submodule structure of $V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$, shows that the image of

this morphism contains all the constituents of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$, thus obtaining the desired embedding. The submodule structure of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is then obtained from that of $V_{\mu, \otimes}$.

The second part of the proof of Theorem 4.1.2 is the content of Section 4.3. The key insight is the introduction of the auxiliary notion of saturation distance on $\mathrm{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ (§4.3.1), relating the position of saturated lattices in τ^σ . Using a *global* input, we give in subsection 4.3.1 a first coarse relation between the saturation and the graph distance (cf. Corollary 4.3.4). Subsequently (§4.3.2) we prove that the three distances are actually equal provided that σ verifies an appropriate condition relating its defect, its graph distance and its saturated distance (we say that σ is *maximally saturated* in τ). In particular, if σ is maximally saturated in τ , the structure of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph (Proposition 4.3.10).

We are hence left to prove that *all* constituents of τ are maximally saturated. This is shown by an induction argument in §4.3.3. The proof of Theorem 4.1.2 concludes this section.

4.1. General setting and main result. Throughout this section, we assume that $\mathcal{O}$ is *absolutely unramified*. Note that all types can be realized over an absolutely unramified coefficient field. We let $\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbf{GL}_3/\mathbb{F}_q$, $\mathbf{T}$ be the split torus of diagonal matrices and write $W = N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{T})/\mathbf{T}$ for the associated Weyl group. Finally, we write $\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Let $\bar{\tau}$ be a $\mathbf{G}$ -representation over $\mathbb{F}$. If $\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\mathrm{Fil}^j(\bar{\tau})\}_{j \geq 0}$ is a decreasing (resp. $\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\mathrm{Fil}_j(\bar{\tau})\}_{j \geq 0}$ is an increasing) filtration on $\bar{\tau}$ it is customary to write $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{F}}^i(\bar{\tau}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{\mathrm{Fil}^i(\bar{\tau})}{\mathrm{Fil}^{i+1}(\bar{\tau})}$ (resp. $\mathrm{gr}_i^{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{\tau}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{\mathrm{Fil}_i(\bar{\tau})}{\mathrm{Fil}_{i-1}(\bar{\tau})}$). We omit the subscripts in the graded pieces if $\mathcal{F}$ is clear from the context (typically when $\mathcal{F}$ is the cosocle filtration) and define $\mathcal{F}$ to be a *semisimple filtration* if the associated graded pieces are semisimple for all $i \geq 0$. For a decreasing filtration $\mathcal{F}$ we always assume that $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{F}}^i(\bar{\tau}) = 0$ implies $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{F}}^j(\bar{\tau}) = 0$ for all $j \geq i$ and define the *length of the filtration* $\mathcal{F}$ to be the minimal index i such that $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{F}}^i(\bar{\tau}) = 0$ (e.g. the radical length of a semisimple module is defined to be 1). Similar conventions apply for increasing filtrations.

We recall that the radical (or cosocle) filtration on $\bar{\tau}$ is defined by $\mathrm{rad}^n(\bar{\tau}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} (I_{\mathrm{rad}})^n \cdot \bar{\tau}$ where I_{rad} is the radical ideal of the group algebra $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{G}]$ (cf. e.g. [Alp86] Proposition 1.4). We write $\ell\ell(\bar{\tau})$ to denote the length of the radical filtration (Loewy length), which coincides with the length of the socle filtration. By construction $\ell\ell(\bar{\tau})$ is the minimal length for a semisimple filtration on $\bar{\tau}$. A *Loewy series* for $\bar{\tau}$ is a semisimple filtration $\{\mathrm{Fil}^j(\bar{\tau})\}_j$ on $\bar{\tau}$ of length $\ell\ell(\bar{\tau})$. It verifies:

$$\mathrm{rad}^n(\bar{\tau}) \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^n(\bar{\tau}) \subseteq \mathrm{soc}_{\ell\ell(\bar{\tau})-n}(\bar{\tau})$$

for all $n \in \{0, \dots, \ell\ell(\bar{\tau})\}$. We normalise the indices of the cosocle (resp. socle) filtration so that $\mathrm{gr}^0(\bar{\tau}) = \mathrm{cosoc}(\bar{\tau})$ and $\mathrm{soc}_0(\bar{\tau}) = \mathrm{soc}(\bar{\tau})$.

From now on we assume that $\bar{\tau}$ is multiplicity free, and work with the radical filtration (if not otherwise specified). Given σ_i, σ_{i+1} such that $\text{Hom}_G(\sigma_k, \text{gr}^k(\bar{\tau})) \neq 0$ for $k \in \{i, i+1\}$, we have a corresponding map

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Ext}_G^1(\text{gr}^i(\bar{\tau}), \text{gr}^{i+1}(\bar{\tau})) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_G^1(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}).$$

Let τ be a K -type and $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be a constituent in $\bar{\tau}$. By [EGS15], Lemma 4.1.1, there exists a unique (up to homothety) $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice $\tau^\sigma \subseteq \tau$ with irreducible cosocle isomorphic to σ . Recall that in §2 we defined a distance function d_{gph} on Serre weights. We now want to relate the graph distance to the submodule structure of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$. To this aim, it is convenient to work using the formalism of Alperin diagrams for $\mathbb{F}[G]$ -modules: in our specific situation (working with multiplicity free representations) the Alperin diagram associated to $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is a directed graph such that the nodes are in bijection with $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ and there is an edge between two nodes if and only if the corresponding constituents lie in two consecutive layers of the radical filtration, and the corresponding map (4.1) is non-zero.

Definition 4.1.1. Let τ, σ be as above. We say that *the Loewy strata of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ are predicted by the extension graph* if

(1) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$\text{gr}^n(\bar{\tau}^\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\tau^\sigma), d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma')=n} \sigma'.$$

We say that *the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph* if the the Loewy strata of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ are predicted by the extension graph and moreover

(2) if $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ are adjacent, $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma) = n$, and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_2, \sigma) = n+1$, then the image of $\frac{\text{rad}_n(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)}{\text{rad}_{n+2}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)}$ via the corresponding map (4.1) is non-zero.

Recall that a tame K -type τ is defined to be *8-deep* if for each irreducible constituent $\sigma = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} F(\mu_i)^{[i]}$ the weights $\mu_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ are all 8-deep in their alcove. By Lemma 4.1.14 and Theorem 4.2.2 we see that if τ is 10-generic, then τ is 8-deep.

Our main result on the representation theory side is the following:

Theorem 4.1.2. *Let τ be a 8-deep tame K -type and let $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. Then*

- (1) *the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph; and*
- (2) *if $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and $\tau^\kappa \hookrightarrow \tau^\sigma$ is a saturated inclusion, then $p^{d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa, \sigma)} \tau^\sigma \hookrightarrow \tau^\kappa$ is a saturated inclusion.*

The proof of Theorem 4.1.2 requires several steps, of both a local and global nature, which will be carried out in the following subsections.

In what follows, we write $\sigma = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} F(\mu_i)^{[i]}$ with $\mu_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ and set $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} p^i \mu_i \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$. We recall the alcove labeling for SL_3 and write $\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J\}$ (cf. [Hum06], §13.9).

We define $\mathrm{Proj}(\sigma)$ to be the projective hull of σ in the category of $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{G}]$ -modules. As $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{G}]$ is a Frobenius algebra, we have an isomorphism $\mathrm{Proj}(\sigma) \cong \mathrm{Inj}(\sigma)$ where $\mathrm{Inj}(\sigma)$ denotes the injective envelope of σ (again in the category of $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{G}]$ -modules, cf. [Alp86], §6, Theorem 4 and 6).

4.1.1. Preliminaries on Injective envelopes. In this preliminary section, we compare injective envelopes of weights for representations of Frobenius kernel and of finite groups. The main goal is to prove that, under genericity conditions, the graph distance introduced in §2.1 can be characterized in terms of non-vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}^1$ -groups (Lemma 4.1.10). We moreover introduce and describe a tensor product $V_{\mu, \otimes}$ of non p -restricted Weyl modules which will play a key role in the proof of a particular case of Theorem 4.1.2

Let $\mathbf{G}_f$ denote the Frobenius kernel of $\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbf{GL}_{3/\mathbb{F}_q}$. The $\mathbf{G}$ -representation $L(\mu)$ remains irreducible when restricted to $\mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{G}_f$ (cf. [Jan03], II.3.10 and II.9.6); for simplicity we write $L(\mu)$ instead of the more standard notation $L_f(\mu) = L(\mu)|_{\mathbf{G}_f}$, $\widehat{L}(\mu) = L(\mu)|_{\mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{T}}$ (cf. *loc. cit.*). We write $Q_f(\mu)$ to denote the injective envelope of the irreducible representation $L(\mu)$ in the category of $\mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{T}$ -modules. It restricts to an injective envelope of $L(\mu)|_{\mathbf{G}_f}$ in the category of $\mathbf{G}_f$ -modules. (As above, $Q_f(\mu)$ is commonly denoted as $\widehat{Q}_f(\mu)$ in the literature, cf. e.g. [Jan03], II.11, while the notation $Q_f(\mu)$ is for an injective envelope as $\mathbf{G}_f$ -representation. Such an abuse shall cause no confusion). As in the case of the finite group $\mathbf{G}$, it is isomorphic to a projective cover of $L(\mu)$ as well.

We recall the following important result:

Theorem 4.1.3. *Assume that $p > 4$. Then both $Q_f(\mu)$ and each of the $Q_1(\mu_i)$ have a unique $\mathbf{G}$ -module structure. Moreover $\mathrm{soc}_{\mathbf{G}}(Q_f(\mu)) = L(\mu)$ and there exists a $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant decomposition*

$$Q_f(\mu) \cong \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} Q_1(\mu_i)^{[i]}.$$

Assume that $\mu \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ is moreover 4-deep. Then

$$(4.2) \quad Q_f(\mu)|_{\mathbf{G}} \cong \mathrm{Proj}(F(\mu)) \cong \mathrm{Inj}(F(\mu))$$

Proof. The first part of the Theorem is well known, cf. [Jan03], II.11.5 (4), II.11.9, II.11.11 and II.11.16 (Remark 2).

The isomorphism (4.2) is a modification of [Pil97], Lemma 2.4(b) (where it is stated when $\mathbf{G}$ is semisimple).

For an integer $r \geq 1$ we write $\mathbf{G}_r \mathbf{T}$ (resp. $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}$) for the pullback of $\mathbf{T}$ (resp. of the standard maximal split torus $\mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}$ of $\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{SL}_{3/\mathbb{F}_p}$) along the r -th Frobenius kernel of $\mathbf{G}$. We set $\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Claim 1. Let M be a $\mathbf{G}$ -module. Then $\text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}(M|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}) = (\text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}}(M))|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}$. The analogous statement holds true for the groups $\mathbf{G}_r \mathbf{T}$, $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}$ and for the finite groups $\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}$ (resp. $\mathbf{Z}_r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{G}_r}{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r}$). For $\bullet \in \{\emptyset, r\}$ the group $\mathbf{Z}_{\bullet}$ is diagonalizable and hence, by the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence, the restriction functor $\text{Res}_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_{\bullet}}^{\mathbf{G}_{\bullet}}$ (which is exact) induces a canonical isomorphism

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}_{\bullet}}^i(M, N) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(\mathbf{Z}_{\bullet}, \text{Ext}_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_{\bullet}}^i(M|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_{\bullet}}, N|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_{\bullet}}))$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\mathbf{G}_{\bullet}$ -modules M, N . In particular $\text{Res}_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_{\bullet}}^{\mathbf{G}_{\bullet}}$ commutes with formation of socles and cosocles. By [Jan03], II.9.5 (11) this implies the required statement for the groups $\mathbf{G}_r \mathbf{T}$, $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}$.

Since $\mathbf{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}$ has order prime to p , we also have

$$(4.4) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^i(M, N) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(\mathbf{Z}, \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}^i(M|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}, N|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}))$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\mathbf{G}$ -modules M, N which implies the statement in the case of finite groups. $\square$

Claim 2. Let $r \geq 1$ and let ν be a p^r -restricted weight. Let $Q_r(\nu)$ be the injective envelope of $L(\nu)$ as a $\mathbf{G}_r \mathbf{T}$ -representation. Then $Q_r(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}}$ is the injective envelope of $L(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}}$ as a $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}$ -module.

Similarly, $\text{Inj}(F(\nu))|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}} \cong \text{Inj}(F(\nu)|_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}})$.

Proof of Claim 2. We first prove that $Q_r(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}}$ is the injective envelope of $L(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r \mathbf{T}^{\text{der}}}$. By [Jan03], II.9.4 it is enough to prove the analogous statement for the infinitesimal group $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r$. As $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r$ is a finite, closed subgroup in $\mathbf{G}_r$, we deduce that $\text{Res}_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r}^{\mathbf{G}_r}$ maps injectives to injectives (since it has a left and a right adjoint, both of which are exact, cf. [Jan03] I.3.5, I.8.14, I.8.16). By Claim 1, we deduce that $Q_r(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r}$ is an injective $(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r$ -module with irreducible socle isomorphic to $L(\nu)|_{(\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}})_r}$, and the conclusion follows as the isomorphism class of an injective indecomposable module is uniquely determined by its socle (cf. [Jan03] I.3.16).

As for the finite group case, the proof follows the same argument. In fact, the restriction $\text{Res}_{\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}}^{\mathbf{G}}$ still has left and right adjoints which are exact (cf. [Vig96], Proposition 5.9 (d)) and we conclude via Claim 1 (we again use the fact that the isomorphism class of an injective indecomposable module is uniquely determined by its socle: cf. [Alp86], Theorem 6.4, Proposition 6.5, Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.3). $\square$

We are now ready to prove (4.2). By [Pil93], Lemma 6.1 and Claim 2, we have

$$(4.5) \quad (Q_f(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}) \cong \text{Inj}(F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}).$$

We claim that $Q_f(\mu)|_G$ is a projective G -module. This will be enough, since $\text{soc}_G(Q_f(\mu))$ is simple and isomorphic to $F(\mu)$ by (4.5) and Claim 1. Since $\mathbb{F}[G] \cong \bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{Z}} \mathbb{F}[G^{\text{der}}] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} e_{\chi}$, where e_{χ} are the standard χ -isotypical orthogonal idempotents, and since the induction $\text{ind}_{G^{\text{der}}}^G$ respects injectives (cf. [Vig96], Proposition 5.9 (b)) we have a decomposition

$$\text{ind}_{G^{\text{der}}}^G(\text{Inj}(F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}})) \cong \bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{Z}} \chi \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} (\text{Inj}(F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}))$$

and each direct summand $\chi \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} (\text{Inj}(F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}))$ is the injective envelope of $\chi \otimes F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}$. The natural map

$$\text{ind}_{G^{\text{der}}}^G(Q_f(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}) \rightarrow Q_f(\mu)|_G$$

verifies $(e_{\chi} \otimes 1) \cdot (1 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} v) \mapsto \delta_{\chi,1} v$ (where we used the identification $\text{ind}_{G^{\text{der}}}^G \bullet \cong \mathbb{F}[G] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[G^{\text{der}}]} \bullet$), by definition of the idempotents e_{χ} . Hence $Q_f(\mu)|_G$ is a direct summand in $\text{ind}_{G^{\text{der}}}^G(\text{Inj}(F(\mu)|_{G^{\text{der}}}))$. $\square$

The following lemmas will be used several times in the rest of this section.

Lemma 4.1.4 ([Pil97], Lemma 3.1). *Let M be a G -module. If M is 6-deep with p^f -bounded highest weight, then*

$$\text{soc}_i^G(M) = \text{soc}_i^G(M), \quad \text{cosoc}_i^G(M) = \text{cosoc}_i^G(M)$$

Proof. The statement on the socle filtration holds true for G^{der} and G^{der} by [Pil97], Lemma 3.1. By duality, noting that M is 6-deep if and only if its linear dual M^* is 6-deep, and that $\text{soc}_{\ell(M)-i}^{\bullet}(M^*) = \text{cosoc}_{\bullet}^i(M)$ for $\bullet \in \{G^{\text{der}}, G^{\text{der}}\}$, we obtain the analogous statement for the cosocle filtration (we have written $\ell(M)$ for the Loewy length of M).

The general case follows from Claim 1 in the proof of Theorem 4.1.3. $\square$

Lemma 4.1.5 (Translation principle). *Let $\lambda, \kappa \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$. Assume that for all weight $\nu \in L(\kappa)$, the weights $\lambda + \nu$ belongs to the same alcove as λ . Then we have the following isomorphism of G -modules:*

$$(1) \quad L(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} L(\kappa) = \bigoplus_{\nu \in L(\kappa)} \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(L(\kappa)_{\nu}) L(\lambda + \nu),$$

$$(2) \quad Q_f(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} L(\kappa) = \bigoplus_{\nu \in L(\kappa)} \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(L(\kappa)_{\nu}) Q_f(\lambda + \nu).$$

Proof. The isomorphisms hold in restriction to $\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}$ by [Pil93], Lemma 5.1. As the LHS and RHS have the same central characters, the $\mathbf{G}^{\text{der}}$ -isomorphisms extend to $\mathbf{G}$ -isomorphisms by (4.3). $\square$

Lemma 4.1.6. *Assume that $p > 4$. Let $r \geq 1$ be an integer and let M be a $\mathbf{G}$ -module satisfying $\langle \kappa, \alpha_0^\vee \rangle \leq 4p^r$ for all $L(\kappa) \in \text{JH}_{\mathbf{G}}(M)$. Let us write $\text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}}(M) = \bigoplus L(\nu)$ for some weights $\nu = \nu^{(r-1)} + p^r \omega_\nu \in X^*(\mathbf{T})$, where $\nu^{(r-1)} \in X_r(\mathbf{T})$.*

The natural $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant inclusion deduced from Theorem 4.1.3:

$$(4.6) \quad \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}}(M) \hookrightarrow \bigoplus Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)}) \otimes L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}$$

extends to a $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant inclusion

$$M \hookrightarrow \bigoplus Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)}) \otimes L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}.$$

Proof. The proof follows closely the argument of [Pil97], Lemma 3.1 (which is in turn based on [And87], Lemma 2.2).

To prove that (4.6) extends to the whole M , it is enough to show that $\text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^1(L(\kappa), \bigoplus Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)}) \otimes L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}) = 0$ for all $L(\kappa) \in \text{JH}_{\mathbf{G}}(M)$. By the hypothesis, we can write $\kappa = \kappa^{(r-1)} + p^r \omega_\kappa$ where $\kappa^{(r-1)} \in X_r(\mathbf{T})$ and ω_κ verifies $\langle \omega_\kappa, \alpha_0^\vee \rangle \leq 3$.

As $Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)})$ is injective as a $\mathbf{G}_r$ -module for all ν , the Lyndon-Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence provides us with a canonical isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^1(L(\kappa), \bigoplus Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)}) \otimes L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}) \\ & \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{G}_r}^1(L(\omega_\kappa)^{[r]}, \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{G}_r}(L(\kappa^{(r-1)}), Q_r(\nu^{(r-1)})) \otimes L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}) \\ & \cong \begin{cases} \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^1(L(\omega_\kappa)^{[r]}, L(\omega_\nu)^{[r]}) & \text{if } \kappa^{(r-1)} = \nu^{(r-1)} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

As $\langle \omega_\kappa, \alpha_0^\vee \rangle, \langle \omega_\nu, \alpha_0^\vee \rangle \leq p - 2$ for all ν (and all κ) it follows that ω_κ and ω_ν lie both in the lower p -restricted alcove; in particular, there are no algebraic extensions between $L(\omega_\kappa)$ and $L(\omega_\nu)$. We obtain the required vanishing of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^1$, and the proof is complete. $\square$

We now describe the modules $Q_f(\mu)$ in more detail. We let $\mu^{\text{op}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)} \cdot \mu$ (resp. $\mu_i^{\text{op}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (13)t_{-p(\omega_{1,i}+\omega_{2,i})} \cdot \mu_i$). The $\mathbf{G}$ -modules $Q_1(\mu_i)$ are rigid, with Loewy length $\ell\ell(Q_1(\mu_i)) = 6 + 1$ and are endowed with a Weyl filtration (cf. [Hum06] §13.9). The irreducible constituents of $Q_1(\mu_i)$ are known (cf. [Hum06], §13.9). In particular, we have injections $V(\mu_i^{\text{op}} + p(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i})) \hookrightarrow Q_1(\mu_i)$ and the Alperin diagram of $V(\mu_i^{\text{op}} + p(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i}))$ is well known (cf. [BDM15], §4, see Table 9 below).

We endow $Q_f(\mu)$ (resp. $V_{\mu,\otimes} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} V(\mu_i^{\text{op}} + p(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i}))$) with the natural tensor product filtration $\text{Fil}_n^\otimes(Q_f(\mu))$ (resp. $\text{Fil}_n^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes})$), inherited from the *socle* filtration on each tensor constituent, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gr}_n^\otimes(Q_f(\mu)) &= \bigoplus_{\sum_i n_i = n} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} \text{gr}_{n_i}(Q_1(\mu_i)^{[i]}) \\ \text{gr}_n^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes}) &= \bigoplus_{\sum_i n_i = n} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} \text{gr}_{n_i}(V(\mu_i^{\text{op}} + p(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i}))^{[i]}) \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(4.7) \quad \ell\ell(Q_f(\mu)) \leq 6f + 1, \quad \ell\ell(V_{\mu,\otimes}) \leq 3f + 1$$

as the tensor filtrations on $Q_f(\mu)$ and $V_{\mu,\otimes}$ are semisimple filtrations of length $6f + 1$ and $3f + 1$ respectively. Note, in particular, that we have a commutative diagram

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} V_{\mu,\otimes} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{gr}_{3f}^\otimes V_{\mu,\otimes} \\ & \searrow & \uparrow \\ & & \text{cosoc}(V_{\mu,\otimes}). \end{array}$$

For later convenience, we give an explicit description of the irreducible constituents of the $\mathbf{G}$ -module $\text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes})$, when μ_i are in alcove B for all i (the general case is a straightforward but somehow tedious formalism and will be left to the reader). For $\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p$ let $n_\mu(\tilde{w}^*) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined by $[\text{gr}_{n_\mu(\tilde{w}^*)}^\otimes V_{\mu,\otimes} : L(\tilde{w}^* \cdot \mu)] \neq 0$. From the definition and the formal properties of the tensor filtration, we tautologically have

$$(4.9) \quad \text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes}) = \bigoplus_{\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p, n_\mu(\tilde{w}^*)=d} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}.$$

We note that the summands $\bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}$ are typically *not* irreducible as the weights $\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i$ are not p -restricted. For $\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p$ we have a unique decomposition $\tilde{w}^* = p(\tilde{w}_-^*) \cdot \tilde{w}_+^*$ where $\tilde{w}_+^* \in \widetilde{W}_+ \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$ and $\tilde{w}_-^* \in X^*(T)$ (and a similar embeddingwise decomposition $\tilde{w}_i^* = p(\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*) \cdot \tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$ with the obvious notation). By the translation principle we have

$$(4.10) \quad \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]} = \bigoplus_{i \neq 0, \varepsilon_i \in L((\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*))} L(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i \neq 0} L(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i + \varepsilon_{i-1})^{[i]} \right) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}$$

Note that the condition $n_\mu(\tilde{w}^*) = 1$ (cf. Table 8) is equivalent to the following condition:

there exists an index j such that:

- (a) $\tilde{w}_i^* = \text{id}$ if $i \neq j$;
- (b) w_j^* is a simple reflection and $\tilde{w}_{j,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2\}$ if $i \neq j$

(recall that w_i^* denotes the projection of $\tilde{w}_i^*$ to the ordinary Weyl group S_3).

Hence for $d = 1$, we have

$$(4.11) \quad L(\tilde{w}_j^* \cdot \mu_j)^{[j]} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \neq j} L(\mu_i)^{[i]} \cong \bigoplus_{\varepsilon_j \in L(\tilde{w}_{j,-}^*)} L(\tilde{w}_{j,+}^* \cdot \mu_j)^{[j]} \otimes L(\mu_{j+1} + \varepsilon_j)^{[j+1]} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \neq j, j+1} L(\mu_i)^{[i]}$$

if $j < f - 1$ and

$$(4.12) \quad L(\tilde{w}_j^* \cdot \mu_j)^{[j]} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \neq j} L(\mu_i)^{[i]} \cong \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-2} L(\mu_i)^{[i]} \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,+}^* \cdot \mu_{f-1})^{[f-1]} \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}$$

else, where, in both cases, w_j^* is a simple reflection.

For the general case when not all μ_i are in alcove B , we have an analogous description of the graded pieces of $V_{\mu, \otimes}$: one has to consider the decomposition $\tilde{w}_i^* = p(\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*)\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$ where $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in W_+$ if μ_i is in alcove A . Same thing applies to $\text{gr}_1^\otimes(Q_f(\mu))$: we have a description analogous to (4.11), (4.12) where $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in W_+$ or $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in W_+ \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$ according to whether μ_i is in alcove A or B respectively.

Lemma 4.1.7. *Let $\mu \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If μ_i is n -deep (in its p -restricted alcove), then $\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i$ is n -deep (in its p -restricted alcove). In particular, if μ_i is n -deep for all i , then $Q_f(\mu)$, $V_{\mu, \otimes}$, $Q_f(\mu)|_G$ and $V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$ are all $n - 2$ -deep.*

Proof. Recall that a weight $\nu \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ is n -deep in alcove A (resp. in alcove B) if and only if $n < \langle \nu + \eta_i, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle < p - n$ for $k = 1, 2$ and $n < \langle \nu + \eta_i, (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)^\vee \rangle < p - n$ (resp. $p + n < \langle \nu + \eta_i, (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)^\vee \rangle < 2p - n$). Let $\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}_+$. An elementary computation shows that $\tilde{w}^* \cdot \mu$ is n -deep if this holds true for each $\mu_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$. The conclusion follows from the description above of $\text{gr}_\otimes^d$, noting that $\langle \varepsilon_{i-1}, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \{-2, \dots, 2\}$ for any $\varepsilon_{i-1} \in L(\tilde{w}_{i-1,-}^*)$ and any positive root $\alpha \in R^+$. $\square$

The following result of independent interest is important to relate the cosocle distance and the graph distance (cf. Lemma 4.1.10):

Proposition 4.1.8. *Assume that $p > 4$. Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} p^i \mu_i \in X^+(\mathbf{T})$, with $\mu_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ for all i , be a p^f -restricted weight, and assume that μ_i is 4-deep for each i . Then*

$$(4.13) \quad \text{gr}_1^{\text{soc}}(Q_f(\mu)) = \text{gr}_1^\otimes(Q_f(\mu))$$

as $\mathbf{G}$ -modules.

Proof. We prove (4.13) by induction on f . To ease notation, let us define $\mu^{(f-2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{f-2} p^i \mu_i$ and consider $L(\mu^{(f-2)}) = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-2} L(\mu_i)^{[i]}$, $Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)}) = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-2} Q_1(\mu_i)^{[i]}$. We freely use the alcove labelling as in [Hum06], §13.9 (cf. Table 9 as well). The exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow L(\mu^{(f-2)}) \longrightarrow Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)}) \longrightarrow \frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \longrightarrow 0 \\ 0 \longrightarrow L(\mu_{f-1}) \longrightarrow Q_1(\mu_{f-1}) \longrightarrow \frac{Q_1(\mu_{f-1})}{L(\mu_{f-1})} \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

and the tensor product decomposition of $Q_f(\mu)$, $L(\mu)$ easily provide us with the exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow L(\mu^{(f-2)}) \otimes \left(\frac{Q_1(\mu_{f-1})}{L(\mu_{f-1})} \right)^{[f-1]} \longrightarrow \frac{Q_f(\mu)}{L(\mu)} \longrightarrow \left(\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \right) \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1})^{[f-1]} \longrightarrow 0.$$

By induction, we have

$$(4.14) \quad \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \right) = \text{gr}_1^{\otimes} (Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)}))$$

and note that the RHS of the latter equation is explicitly described, *mutatis mutandis*, by (4.11), (4.12). Let us define $\mathcal{H}$ to be the set of the highest weights of the simple $\mathbf{G}$ -modules appearing in $\text{gr}_1^{\otimes} (Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)}))$. For all $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}$ we therefore can write $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)} + p^{f-1} \omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ where $\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)} \in X_{f-1}(\mathbf{T})$ and $\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}} \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2\}$ (and actually $\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}} = 0$ if $\tilde{\lambda}$ is one of the weights appearing in (4.11)).

We see that Lemma 4.1.6 applies (with $r = f - 1$) to $\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})}$ and hence the $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant embedding

$$(4.15) \quad \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \right) \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}} Q_{f-1}(\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)}) \otimes L(\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}})^{[f-1]}$$

extends to a $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant embedding

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}} Q_{f-1}(\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)}) \otimes L(\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}})^{[f-1]}.$$

By exactness of tensor product, the $\mathbf{G}$ -equivariant embedding (4.16) extends to

$$\begin{aligned} (4.17) \quad \frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1})^{(f-1)} &\hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}} Q_{f-1}(\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)}) \otimes (L(\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}) \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1}))^{[f-1]} = \\ &= \bigoplus_{\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}} \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}})} Q_{f-1}(\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)}) \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1} + \varepsilon)^{[f-1]} \end{aligned}$$

where the latter equality follows from the translation principle (Lemma 4.1.5).

As formation of socle is left exact we have:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(L(\mu^{(f-2)}) \otimes \left(\frac{Q_1(\mu_{f-1})}{L(\mu_{f-1})} \right)^{[f-1]} \right) \rightarrow \text{gr}_1^{\mathbf{G}\text{-soc}}(Q_f(\mu)) \rightarrow \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1})^{(f-1)} \right).$$

From (4.17), the tensor product decomposition of the $\mathbf{G}$ -modules of the form $Q_f(\kappa)$, $L(\kappa)$, for $\kappa \in X_{f-1}(\mathbf{T})$ and translation principle for weights (Lemma 4.1.5), we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(\frac{Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})}{L(\mu^{(f-2)})} \otimes Q_1(\mu_{f-1})^{(f-1)} \right) &\subseteq \bigoplus_{\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}} L(\tilde{\lambda}^{(f-2)}) \otimes (L(\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}) \otimes L(\mu_{f-1}))^{[f-1]} = \\ &= \text{gr}_1^{\otimes}(Q_{f-1}(\mu^{(f-2)})) \otimes L(\mu_{f-1})^{[f-1]} \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from again from the explicit description (4.11), (4.12).

In a similar fashion, we see that

$$\text{soc}_{\mathbf{G}} \left(L(\mu^{(f-2)}) \otimes \left(\frac{Q_1(\mu_{f-1})}{L(\mu_{f-1})} \right)^{[f-1]} \right) \subseteq L(\mu^{(f-2)}) \otimes \text{gr}_1^{\otimes} \left(\frac{Q_1(\mu_{f-1})}{L(\mu_{f-1})} \right)^{[f-1]}.$$

Hence

$$\text{gr}_1^{\mathbf{G}\text{-soc}}(Q_f(\mu)) \subseteq \text{gr}_1^{\otimes}(Q_f(\mu)).$$

The reverse inclusion is obvious as the tensor filtration is a semisimple filtration. $\square$

We immediately deduce:

Corollary 4.1.9. *Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} p^i \mu_i \in X^+(\mathbf{T})$, with $\mu_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ for all i , be a p^f -restricted weight and assume that $Q_f(\mu)$ is 6-deep. Then*

$$(4.18) \quad \text{gr}_1^{\text{soc}}(\text{Proj}(\sigma)) = (\text{gr}_1^{\otimes}(Q_f(\mu)))|_{\mathbf{G}}$$

as $\mathbf{G}$ -modules.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.1.8, Lemma 4.1.4 and Theorem 4.1.3. $\square$

We are now ready to give an alternative characterization of adjacency for the constituents of the extension graph: the following lemma justifies the name “extension graph” introduced in Section 2:

Lemma 4.1.10. *Assume that μ_i is 4-deep for all i and consider the graph centered in $\mu + \eta - \underline{1}$. Then $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = 1$ if and only if there exists an index $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ such that*

$$[(F(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \neq j} F(\mu_j)^{[j]})|_{\mathbf{G} : \kappa}] \neq 0$$

where w_i^* is a non-trivial simple reflection, $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in (W_+)_i$ or $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in (W_+)_i \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$ according to whether μ_i is in alcove A or B respectively. If moreover μ_i is 8-deep

for all i then $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = 1$ if and only if $\text{Ext}_G^1(\sigma, \kappa) \neq 0$ (in which case the dimension of the Ext^1 group is 1).

Proof. The first part follows from a direct computation, using the definition of the graph distance and Lemma 4.1.5. For the second part, we first recall that $\text{Ext}_G^1(\sigma, \kappa) \neq 0$ if and only if $[\text{gr}^1(\text{Proj}(\sigma)) : \kappa] \neq 0$. Since μ_i is 8-deep for all i , we deduce that $Q_f(\mu)$ is 6-deep: the conclusion follows from Corollary 4.1.9 and the explicit description of $\text{gr}_{\otimes}^1(Q_f(\mu))$ in (4.11). $\square$

Remark 4.1.11. It is likely the case that the second part of Lemma 4.1.10 holds true with the weaker assumption that μ_i is 6-deep for all i (in which case the statement of Theorem 4.1.2 holds with the type being 8-generic).

4.1.2. Cosocle distance and graph distance. Let τ be a tame K -type and $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be a constituent. We introduce the notion of *cosocle distance from σ in $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$* and establish some of its properties with respect to the graph distance (cf. Lemma 4.1.17). We end the section by introducing the notion of *extension path in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$* (Definition 4.1.18), which will be widely used in the remainder of Section 4. We warn the reader that the cosocle distance is *a priori* not necessarily a distance function on $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$.

Definition 4.1.12. Let $\sigma, \sigma_1 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. We define the *cosocle distance of σ_1 from σ* to be the unique integer $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{Hom}_G(\sigma_1, \text{gr}^d(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)) \neq 0.$$

As $\text{cosoc}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ is simple, we see that $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma') = 0$ implies $\sigma = \sigma'$.

Lemma 4.1.13. Let τ be a K -type and $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. We have $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\kappa)$ for all $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ if and only if the Loewy strata of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ are predicted by the extension graph.

Proof. This is immediate from the definitions. $\square$

We now compare the cosocle distance and the graph distance. We start with the following observation.

Lemma 4.1.14. Let τ be an n -generic type. Then τ is $n - 2$ deep.

Proof. We first of all remark that if $\lambda \in X(\underline{T})$ is a weight which is n -deep in alcove $\underline{C}$ and $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_p$, then $\tilde{w} \cdot \lambda$ is n -deep in alcove $\tilde{w} \cdot \underline{C}$.

If we write $\tau = R_s(\mu + \eta)$ with μ being n -deep it is hence enough to prove that $r(\sigma)$ is $n - 2$ deep for any obvious weight σ in $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. This follows from Proposition 2.2.6. $\square$

We deduce from Lemma 4.1.10:

Corollary 4.1.15. *Assume that the type τ is 8-deep and $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\tau)$. Then $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma') \leq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma')$ for all $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\tau)$.*

Proof. The assumption that the type τ is 8-deep implies, by Lemma 4.1.14, that all the elements in $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 4.1.10. If $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and $k + 1 = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\kappa)$, then $\text{Ext}_G^1(\kappa, \text{gr}^k(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)) \neq 0$. Hence $\text{Ext}_G^1(\kappa, \kappa') \neq 0$ for some $\kappa' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ with $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\kappa') = k$. In other words, $d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa, \kappa') = 1$ by Lemma 4.1.10. If $d = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma')$, we conclude that there is a sequence of weights σ_i for $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$ such that $\sigma_0 = \sigma$, $\sigma_d = \sigma'$, and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}) = 1$ for all i . Hence $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma') \leq d$. $\square$

We establish some properties of $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}$.

Lemma 4.1.16. *Let $\sigma, \sigma_1 \in \text{JH}(\tau)$. There is a unique minimal subrepresentation $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1) \subseteq \bar{\tau}^\sigma$ containing σ_1 as a Jordan–Hölder factor. Moreover, we have that*

- (1) $\text{cosoc}(Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)) \cong \sigma_1$; and
- (2) $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)$ is the image of any nonzero map $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma_1} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma$.

Proof. Let $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)$ be the image of any nonzero map $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma_1} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma$. It is clear that $\text{cosoc}(Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)) \cong \sigma_1$. Suppose that $M \subset \bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is a subrepresentation containing σ_1 as a Jordan–Hölder factor. As $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is multiplicity free, $\bar{\tau}^\sigma/M$ does not contain σ_1 as a Jordan–Hölder factor, and hence the composition $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1) \hookrightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma/M$ is 0, or equivalently, $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1) \subset M$. $\square$

Lemma 4.1.17. *Let $\sigma, \sigma_1 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and let $\sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(Q_\sigma(\sigma_1))$. If $n = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_1}(\sigma_2)$, then we have $\text{Hom}_G(\sigma_2, \text{gr}_{\text{rad}}^n(Q_\sigma(\sigma_1))) \neq 0$. Moreover $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_2) \geq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_1) + d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_1}(\sigma_2)$.*

Note that, a priori, the inequality may be strict.

Proof. Since formation of cosocle is right exact, we see that the map $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma_1} \twoheadrightarrow Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)$ is strictly compatible with the cosocle filtrations. This proves the first claim.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\text{Fil}^k(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)\}_k$ be the decreasing filtration defined by $\text{Fil}^k(\bar{\tau}^\sigma) = \text{rad}^{k+d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_1)}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ (i.e. $\mathcal{F}$ is the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ shifted by $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_1)$). Under the inclusion $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1) \hookrightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma$, $\mathcal{F}$ induces a semisimple filtration on $Q_\sigma(\sigma_1)$, beginning at 0. So, with the radical filtration on the domain and $\mathcal{F}$ on the codomain, this inclusion is compatible with the filtrations. This immediately gives $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_2) - d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_1) \geq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_1}(\sigma_2)$ for any $\sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(Q_\sigma(\sigma_1))$. $\square$

We introduce the notion of *extension path* in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$, which will be used in the rest of this section.

Definition 4.1.18. Let $0 \leq i \leq k \leq \ell(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ be integers and let $\sigma_i \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ be a constituent satisfying $d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_i) = i$. An extension path (of starting point σ_i and length $k - i + 1$) in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is a sequence $(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}, \dots, \sigma_k)$ of constituents of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ such that

- (1) $d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_j) = j$ for all $j \in \{i, \dots, k\}$;
- (2) for all $j \in \{i, \dots, k-1\}$ the image of $\frac{\text{rad}_j(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)}{\text{rad}_{j+2}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)}$ via the corresponding map (4.1) is non-zero.

In order to emphasize property (2) above we write

$$\sigma_k \leftarrow \sigma_{k-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_{i-1} \leftarrow \sigma_i$$

to denote the extension path associated to $(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}, \dots, \sigma_k)$, with starting point σ_i .

We remark that an extension path gives rise to a geodesic path in the extension graph. The converse is equivalent to the first part of Theorem 4.1.2.

4.2. Proof of the structure theorem for defect zero weights. In this subsection, we prove the first part of Theorem 4.1.2 in the particular case of defect zero, lower alcove weights:

Theorem 4.2.1. *Let τ be a 8-deep type and let $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be a constituent with $\text{Def}(\sigma) = 0$. Assume that $\sigma = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} F(\lambda_i)^{[i]}$ where $\lambda_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ is a p -restricted and lower alcove weight for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$.*

Then the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph.

As mentioned in the outline, Theorem 4.2.1 is proved by local techniques, embedding $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ in an algebraic representation of the form $V_{\mu,\otimes}$ (introduced in Section 4.1.1) and whose submodule structure can be determined using methods from the modular representation theory of algebraic groups.

The outline of this section is the following. In 4.2.1, we provide the key comparison result for the representation $V_{\mu,\otimes}|_G$, describing its Loewy strata and the non-split extensions between graded pieces in terms of the extension graph. In section 4.2.2, we construct an embedding $\bar{\tau}^\sigma \hookrightarrow V_{\mu,\otimes}|_G$, hence deducing the submodule structure of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ in terms of the extension graph.

4.2.1. The Weyl module $V_{\mu,\otimes}$ and the extension graph. We now describe the Weyl module $V_{\mu,\otimes}$. Fix once and for all a p^f -restricted weight $\mu \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ such that $\mu_i \in B$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$. Recall that $\underline{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Res}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathbf{GL}_3)$ and $\underline{T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Res}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathbf{T})$, and Λ_W is the weight lattice of $\underline{G}^{\text{der}}$. Let $\Lambda_\eta \subseteq \Lambda_W$ be the convex hull of the W -orbit of $(\omega_1 + \omega_2)$. Concretely, we have

$$\Lambda_\eta = \left\{ (\nu_i)_i \in \Lambda_W, \nu_i \in \{0, \pm\omega_1, \pm\omega_2, \pm(\omega_1 + \omega_2), \pm(\omega_1 - \omega_2), \pm(2\omega_1 - \omega_2), \pm(\omega_1 - 2\omega_2)\} \right\}$$

We define further the subgraph $\Lambda_{\preceq(\eta,0)} \subseteq \Lambda_\eta \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^f$ as follows:

$$\Lambda_{\preceq(\eta,0)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_\eta \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^f, \text{ such that } a_i = 0 \text{ if } \omega_i = w_i(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i}) \text{ for some } w_i \in S_3\}$$

The main result concerning $V_{\mu,\otimes}$ is the following:

Theorem 4.2.2. *Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} p^i \mu_i \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ be a p^f -restricted weight such that μ_i lies 2-deep in alcove B for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$.*

(1) *The translation map $\mathfrak{Tr}_{(\mu^{\text{op}}+\eta-\underline{1})} : \Lambda_W^{(\mu^{\text{op}}+\eta-\underline{1})} \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^f \rightarrow X_1(\mathbf{T})/\langle(p^f-\pi)X^0(\mathbf{T})\rangle$ induces a bijection:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Tr}_{(\mu^{\text{op}}+\eta-\underline{1})} : \Lambda_{\preceq(\eta,0)} &\rightarrow \text{JH}(V_{\mu,\otimes}|_G) \\ (\omega, a) &\mapsto \sigma_{(\omega,a)}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *We have*

$$[\text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes})|_G : \sigma_{(\omega,a)}] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(\underline{0},\underline{1})}, \sigma_{(\omega,a)}) \\ 0 & \text{if } d < d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(\underline{0},\underline{1})}, \sigma_{(\omega,a)}) \end{cases}$$

for all $(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_{\preceq(\eta,0)}$.

(3) *If $(\omega, a), (\omega', a') \in \Lambda_{\preceq(\eta,0)}$ are such that $d_{\text{gph}}((\underline{0}, \underline{1}), (\omega, a)) = d$, $d_{\text{gph}}((\underline{0}, \underline{1}), (\omega', a')) = d-1$, and $d_{\text{gph}}((\omega, a), (\omega', a')) = 1$, then the natural map*

$$\text{Ext}_G^1(\text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes})|_G, \text{gr}_{d-1}^\otimes(V_{\mu,\otimes})|_G) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_G^1(\sigma_{(\omega,a)}, \sigma_{(\omega',a')})$$

is nonzero.

The proof of Theorem 4.2.2 is carried out in a series of steps and will occupy the remainder of this subsection. The most important and delicate part of Theorem 4.2.2 is the non-splitness of the extension between consecutive grades pieces (item (3)): its proof needs a technical input (Proposition 4.2.5) on the restriction map to the finite group of extensions of irreducible algebraic representation with non p -restricted weights.

In what follows, given $\tilde{w}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p$, we consider the unique decomposition $(p\tilde{w}_-^*) \cdot \tilde{w}_+^*$ where $\tilde{w}_+^* \in W_+ \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$ and $\tilde{w}_-^* \in X^*(\underline{T})$.

Proposition 4.2.3. *Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} p^i \mu_i \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ be a p^f -restricted weight such that μ_i lies 2-deep in alcove B for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$. Then κ is an irreducible constituent of $(V_{\mu,\otimes})|_G$ if and only if we can write*

$$(4.19) \quad \kappa = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} F(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i + \varepsilon'_{i-1})^{[i]}$$

where $\tilde{w}_+^* = (\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*)_i \in W_+ \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$, $\varepsilon'_i \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2\}$ and $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \neq \text{id}$ if $\varepsilon'_i = \omega_1 + \omega_2$.

Proof. We first note that the Jordan–Hölder factors of $V_{\mu, \otimes}$ are the constituents of representations of the form $\bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}$ where $\tilde{w}^* = (\tilde{w}_i^*)_i \in \widetilde{W}_p$ is such that $\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i \in \{A, B, C, D, E, F, G\}$ (cf. Table 8 for a list of those elements). By Lemma 4.1.7, we see that $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i$ is 2-deep in its alcove for any $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$.

From Table 8, we see that $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \neq \text{id}$ if $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^* = \omega_1 + \omega_2$, while there are no constraints on $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \in (W_+)_i \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$ if $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2\}$. The translation principle for weights (Lemma 4.1.5) applies, and we have the following decomposition:

$$\bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]} = \bigoplus_{(\varepsilon'_i)_i \in L(\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*)} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i + \varepsilon'_{i-1})^{[i]}$$

where $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2\}$ and $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \neq \text{id}$ if $\varepsilon'_i = \omega_1 + \omega_2$. We obtain a G -equivariant isomorphism

$$(4.20) \quad \kappa \cong \bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_{+,i}^* \cdot \mu_i + \varepsilon'_{i-1})^{[i]}$$

as in the statement of the proposition. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2.2(1). This is a simple combinatorial check using Propositions 2.1.4 and 4.2.3 and observing that $\mu + \varepsilon'$ and $\lambda^{(0)} + \varepsilon' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu + \varepsilon'_{i-1})_i$ (with $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$ and ε'_{i-1} as in the statement of Proposition 4.2.3) are $\widetilde{W}$ -linked, have the same central character, and if $\varepsilon'_i = w(\omega_1 + \omega_2)$ for some $w \in S_3$ and i , then $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu$ is in alcove A . $\square$

Proposition 4.2.4. *Keep the assumption of Proposition 4.2.3. Suppose that $(\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W^{(\mu^{\text{op}} + \eta - 1)}$ is such that $d = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(0,1)}, \sigma_{(\omega,a)})$. Then*

$$[\text{gr}_d^{\otimes}(V_{\mu, \otimes})|_G : \sigma_{(\omega,a)}] = 1.$$

Proof. Suppose that (ω_i, a_i) is at distance d_i from $(0, 1)$. Then one can check that $\sigma_{(\omega,a)}$ appears with multiplicity one in $(\bigotimes_i \text{gr}_{d_{i+1}} V_{\mu_i}^{[i]})|_G$. The key point is that, following the decomposition (4.10) there is a unique choice of ε'_i for each i , and this weight appears in $F(\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*)$ with multiplicity one.

Now suppose that $\sigma_{(\omega,a)}$ appears in $(\bigotimes_i \text{gr}_{d'_{i+1}} V_{\mu_i}^{[i]})|_G$, and occurs in the summand $\bigotimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}|_G$ with $L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i) \hookrightarrow \text{gr}_{d_i} V_{\mu_i}$. Then $\bar{\omega} \in \Lambda_W / \Lambda_R$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ determine the alcoves containing $\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i$ unless $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i = \mu_i^{\text{op}}$ (i.e. $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i$ is in alcove A) since A and G are the only alcoves in $\{A, B, C, D, E, F, G\}$ which differ by a translation in $p\Lambda_R$. For such an i either $d'_i = 0$ or $d'_i = 3$, else $d'_i = d_i$. The conclusion follows. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2.2(2). If $d < d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(\underline{0}, \underline{1})}, \sigma_{(\omega, a)})$, then $[\text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu, \otimes})|_G : \sigma_{(\omega, a)}] = 0$ by the statement dual to Corollary 4.1.15. If $d = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(\underline{0}, \underline{1})}, \sigma_{(\omega, a)})$, then $[\text{gr}_d^\otimes(V_{\mu, \otimes})|_G : \sigma_{(\omega, a)}] = 1$ by Proposition 4.2.4. $\square$

We now move to prove item (3) in Theorem 4.2.2. It is the most delicate part and relies on the following technical proposition.

Proposition 4.2.5. *Let $\tilde{w}^*, \tilde{y}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p$. Assume the alcoves containing $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{w}^* \cdot \mu, \theta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{y}^* \cdot \mu$ are in $\{A, B, C, D, E, F, G\}^f$ and that there exists an index $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ such that $\tilde{w}_i^* = \tilde{y}_i^*$ if $i \neq i_0$ and $\text{Ext}_{\mathbf{G}}^1(L(\theta_{i_0})^{[i_0]}, L(\lambda_{i_0})^{[i_0]}) \neq 0$. Let $M^{[i_0]}$ be the unique non-split extension of $L(\theta_{i_0})^{[i_0]}$ by $L(\lambda_{i_0})^{[i_0]}$ and define*

$$M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{i \neq i_0} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]} \otimes M^{[i_0]}.$$

Finally, let $F_0, F_1 \in \text{JH}(M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)})$ be constituents of $M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}$ such that $[M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} : F_0] = 1 = [M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} : F_1]$.

If $d_{\text{gph}}(F_0, F_1) = 1$ and M is 6-deep, then the natural map

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}^1\left(\text{gr}_1^{\text{soc}}(M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}), \text{gr}_0^{\text{soc}}(M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)})\right) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_p)}^1(F_1, F_0)$$

is non-zero.

Proof. We can assume, without loss of generality, that $i_0 = 0$. We write $\lambda_i = \tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i + p\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*$ (resp. $\theta_0 = \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0 + p\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*$) where $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*, \tilde{y}_{0,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2\}$; recall that $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \neq \text{id}$ (resp. $\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \neq \text{id}$) if $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^* = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ (resp. $\tilde{y}_{0,-}^* = \omega_1 + \omega_2$).

The $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -module M is endowed with its natural tensor product filtration, inherited from the socle filtration on $M^{[0]}$ and the one-step filtration on $\otimes_{i \neq 0} L(\lambda_i)^{[i]}$. Note that even though $\otimes_{i \neq 0} L(\lambda_i)^{[i]}$ is not irreducible, it is easily seen to be semisimple by the translation principle, as each of $\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i, \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0$ is 2-deep in the p -restricted alcove and $\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*, \tilde{y}_{0,-}^* \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2\}$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gr}_0^\otimes(M) &= \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\lambda_i)^{[i]} \cong L(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^{f-1} (L(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{i-1,-}^*))^{[i]} \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]} \\ \text{gr}_1^\otimes(M) &= L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes \bigotimes_{i=2}^{f-1} (L(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{i-1,-}^*))^{[i]} \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}. \end{aligned}$$

and, as it was for $\otimes_{i \neq 0} L(\lambda_i)^{[i]}$, the graded pieces above are semisimple.

An irreducible summand in $\bigotimes_{i=2}^{f-1} (L(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{i-1,-}^*))^{[i]}$ has the form $L(\sum_{i=2}^{f-1} p^i \tilde{\lambda}_i)$ where $\tilde{\lambda}_i = \tilde{w}_{i,+}^* \cdot \mu_i + \varepsilon_{i-1}$ and $\varepsilon_{i-1} \in L(\tilde{w}_{i-1,-}^*)$. We write then $L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) = L(\sum_{i=2}^{f-1} p^i \tilde{\lambda}_i)$ to ease

notation and set

$$M_0(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M^{[0]} \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}$$

which is a direct summand in M . As $d_{\text{gph}}(F_0, F_1) = 1$, we see by Proposition 4.1.8 that F_0 and F_1 appear in two consecutive layers of the tensor filtration on a direct summand constituent of M of the form $M_0(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1})$ for some $\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}$. In what follows, we write M_0 for the unique constituent of M of the form $M_0(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1})$ and verifying $[M|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} : F_k] = 1$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$.

We are hence left to prove that

$$(4.21) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}^1 \left(\text{gr}_1(M_0|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}), \text{gr}_0(M_0|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}) \right) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}^1(F_1, F_0)$$

is non-zero. In (4.21) we consider the $\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -socle filtration on M_0 , which coincides with the $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -socle filtration by Lemma 4.1.4 (note that the $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -socle filtration on M_0 coincides with the natural tensor filtration as $L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}$ is semisimple).

The hypotheses of Lemma 4.1.6 apply to $M^{[0]}$ and hence the $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -equivariant embedding:

$$(4.22) \quad \text{soc}_{\mathbf{GL}_3}(M^{[0]}) \hookrightarrow Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]}$$

extends to a $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -equivariant embedding $M^{[0]} \hookrightarrow Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]}$.

In what follows we perform an explicit technical computation on the graded pieces of the tensor filtration on certain injective envelopes to show that the map (4.21) is non-zero.

By the translation principle (Lemma 4.1.5), we have a $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -equivariant decomposition:

$$(4.23) \quad Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) \cong \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)} Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon).$$

The Loewy filtration of each $Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0)$, $Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)$ ($\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)$) is known (cf. [Hum06], 13.9 for a concise reference; see also [AM01], Proposition 8.4 and its proof, and [Jan03], II.D.4). An easy check on the constituents of $\text{gr}_1(Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]})$ (cf. Table 10) shows that there exists a unique $\tilde{z}_0^* = (p\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \cdot \tilde{y}_{0,+}^*$ with $\tilde{z}_{0,-}^* \in X^*(\mathbf{T})$ such that

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{gr}_1(M^{[0]}) &= L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]} \xrightarrow{\oplus} L(\tilde{z}_0^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]} = L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \\ &\xrightarrow{\oplus} \text{gr}_1(Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]}) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{gr}_1(M_0) &\xrightarrow{\oplus} L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]} \\ &\xrightarrow{\oplus} \text{gr}_1^{\otimes} (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}) \end{aligned}$$

From Table 10, it is easy to deduce the possible weight configurations for relevant constituents in $\mathrm{gr}_1(Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]})$ (from which one can deduce their relative position with $L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]}$).

We now consider the restriction to the finite group. Using again the translation principle (4.23) the direct summands appearing in (4.25) have the following restriction to the finite group:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathrm{gr}_1(M_0)|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} &= (L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}) \\
 &= \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*)} (L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}); \\
 (4.26) \quad & (L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]})|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} = \\
 &= (L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}) \\
 &= \bigoplus_{\varepsilon'' \in L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*)} \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)} (L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon''))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1});
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.27) \quad & (\mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}))|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} = \\
 &= (\mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes ((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1})))|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} \\
 &= \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)} (\mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes ((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}))|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For each weight $\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)$ we obtain from (4.25) and (4.27) the following $\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -equivariant morphisms ι_ε :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.28) \quad & \mathrm{gr}_1(M_0) \xrightarrow{\oplus} \underbrace{L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}}_{=(4.26)} \\
 (4.29) \quad & \xrightarrow{\oplus} \underbrace{\bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)} \mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes ((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}))}_{=(4.27)} \\
 & \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes ((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

We claim that for any $\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)$ the representation $\iota_\varepsilon(\mathrm{gr}_1(M_0))$ has maximal length, i.e. that Jordan-Hölder constituents of $\iota_\varepsilon(\mathrm{gr}_1(M_0))$ coincide with

$$\mathrm{JH}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathrm{gr}_1(M_0)) \cap \mathrm{JH}_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathrm{gr}_1^\otimes ((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2;f-1})).$$

This is enough to prove that the image of M_0 via (4.21) is non zero, since

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}))|_{\mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)} \\
 &= \bigoplus_{\varepsilon' \in L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)} Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0 + \varepsilon') \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \\
 &\hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{\varepsilon' \in L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)} \text{Proj}(L(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0 + \varepsilon') \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}))
 \end{aligned}$$

and any non-split extension of F_1 by F_0 is realized in the second layer of the socle filtration of $\text{Proj}(F_0)$.

From Table 10, we see that $\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*, \tilde{w}_{0,-}^*$ are either zero, or fundamental weights. We treat the case where both $\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*$ and $\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*$ are non-zero (the case where one of them is zero is easy and left to the reader).

Hence, assume that $(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*, \tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) = (\omega_i, \omega_j)$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. We treat first the (much) trickier case $i = j$. Let us write $c : L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) \rightarrow L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*)$ for the involution that switches the two tensor factors. We have a decomposition $L(\omega_i) \otimes L(\omega_i) = L(2\omega_i) \oplus L(\omega_{i+1} + (-1)^{i+1}\underline{1})$. Hence the $\mathbf{GL}_3$ -equivariant inclusion of (4.24) becomes

$$L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{y}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]} \xrightarrow{\oplus} L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\omega_{i+1} + (-1)^{i+1}\underline{1}))^{[1]} \bigoplus L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(2\omega_i))^{[1]}$$

and since the RHS is multiplicity free (as an algebraic representation), it identifies $\text{gr}_1(M^{[0]})$ with the subspace of $L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes (L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]}$ where c acts as multiplication by -1 . By tensoring with $L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)^{[f]}$ and restricting to the finite group, we conclude that the natural inclusion (4.28) identifies $\text{gr}_1(M_0)$ with the subspace of $(L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1})$ where c acts as multiplication by -1 . An easy computation shows that for a weight $\kappa \in L(\omega_{i+1} + (-1)^{i+1}\underline{1})$, the κ -isotypical component of $L(\omega_i) \otimes L(\omega_i)$ is two dimensional. In particular, $\text{gr}_1(M_0)$ appears in $(L(\tilde{y}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes (L(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1) \otimes L(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*))^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1})$ with multiplicity 2. On the other hand, the involution c on the RHS of (4.28) does not respect the direct sum decomposition (4.29), i.e. the action of the involution c on (4.26) switches ε'' and ε . We conclude that for each $\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)$ the image of $\text{gr}_1(M_0)$ via (4.28) and the natural projection

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \bigoplus_{\varepsilon \in L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)} \text{gr}_1((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1})) \\
 & \twoheadrightarrow \text{gr}_1((Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{f-1,-}^*)) \otimes Q_1(\tilde{w}_{1,+}^* \cdot \mu_1 + \varepsilon)^{[1]} \otimes L(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,f-1}))
 \end{aligned}$$

is maximal, as required.

The case where $(\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*, \tilde{w}_{0,-}^*) = (\omega_i, \omega_j)$ with $i \neq j$ is much easier. Indeed, we have the decomposition $L(\omega_i) \otimes L(\omega_j) = L(\omega_1 + \omega_2) \oplus L(0)$, while we see from Table 10 that $\tilde{y}_{0,-}^* = t_{\omega_1 + \omega_2}$. As we are assuming multiplicity one for the constituents F_0, F_1 we deduce that F_1 appears in a direct summand constituent of (4.26) for a unique pair $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon'')$ (which verifies moreover $\varepsilon + \varepsilon'' \neq 0$). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2.2(3). Let (ω, a) and (ω', a') be as in the statement of Theorem 4.2.2(3). Since $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{(\omega', a')}, \sigma_{(\omega, a)}) = 1$ we can find $\tilde{w}^*, \tilde{y}^* \in \widetilde{W}_p$ as in the statement of Proposition 4.2.3 so that

- (1) we have $[\otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{y}_i^* \cdot \mu)^{[i]} : \sigma_{(\omega, a)}] \neq 0$ and $[\otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu)^{[i]} : \sigma_{(\omega', a')}] \neq 0$;
- (2) if $d_i, d'_i \in \mathbb{N}$ are defined by $[\text{gr}_{d_i} V_{\mu_i} : L(\tilde{y}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)] \neq 0$, $[\text{gr}_{d'_i} V_{\mu_i} : L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)] \neq 0$ then $\sum_i d_i = (\sum_i d'_i) - 1$.

Let $d = \sum_i d_i$ and set $L = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{y}_i^* \cdot \mu)^{[i]}$, $L' = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu)^{[i]}$. Since there is an extension of $\sigma_{(\omega, a)}$ by $\sigma_{(\omega', a')}$, there exists an index i_0 such that $\tilde{w}_i^* = \tilde{y}_i^*$ for all $i \neq i_0$ and there is a non-trivial extension of $L(\tilde{y}_{i_0}^* \cdot \mu_{i_0})$ by $L(\tilde{w}_{i_0}^* \cdot \mu_{i_0})$. From the explicit description of the Alperin diagram of $V(\mu_i^{\text{op}} + p(\omega_{1,i} + \omega_{2,i}))$ ([BDM15] §4) and the formal properties of tensor filtrations there is a subquotient of $\text{Fil}_d^{\otimes} V_{\mu, \otimes} / \text{Fil}_{d-2}^{\otimes} V_{\mu, \otimes}$ isomorphic to a nontrivial extension E of L by L' . By Proposition 4.2.5, the image of $E|_G$ in $\text{Ext}_G^1(\sigma_{(\omega, a)}, \sigma_{(\omega', a')})$ is nonzero. $\square$

4.2.2. The embedding argument. In this subsection, we conclude the proof of Theorem 4.2.1. We construct a non-zero map $\bar{\tau}^\sigma \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$ (Proposition 4.2.7), which is proven to be an embedding thanks to Theorem 4.2.2. In this subsection, by abuse of notation, we denote $V_{\mu, \otimes}|_G$ by $V_{\mu, \otimes}$.

From now onwards we assume that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ the weight μ_i is 8-deep in alcove B . By Lemma 4.1.14, the K -type $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_s(\mu^{\text{op}} + \eta - \underline{1})$ is therefore 6-deep. We write $\sigma^{\text{op}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mu)$ and note that the Jordan-Hölder constituent at maximal graph distance $3f+1$ is

$$\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mu^{\text{op}} + s(\omega_1 + \omega_2))$$

To ease notation, we write $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu^{\text{op}} + s(\omega_1 + \omega_2)$ and set $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\lambda)$.

Lemma 4.2.6. *Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} \mu_i p^i \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ be a weight such that $\mu_i \in B$ is 8-deep for all i and $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_s(\mu^{\text{op}} + \eta - \underline{1})$. Set $\sigma^{\text{op}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mu)$ and let $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\lambda) \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be the unique constituent at maximal graph distance. We have:*

$$[\text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}}) : \sigma] = [V_{\mu, \otimes} : \sigma] = [(\text{gr}_{3f}^{\otimes}(V_{\mu, \otimes}))|_G : \sigma] = 1.$$

In particular, $[\text{cosoc}_G(V_{\mu, \otimes}) : \sigma] = 1$.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 4.2.2(1), it is not hard to see that if $[\otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}|_G : \sigma] \neq 0$ then $\tilde{w}_i^* = (13)t_{-2p(\omega_1 + \omega_2)}$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ and moreover $[\otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} L(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]}|_G : \sigma] = 1$.

This gives $[V_{\mu, \otimes} : \sigma] = 1$. As similar analysis using the known Loewy series on $Q_1(\mu_i)$ shows that $[\text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}}) : \sigma] = 1$. By Theorem 4.2.2(2), we have $[(\text{gr}_{3f}^{\otimes}(V_{\mu, \otimes}))|_G : \sigma] = 1$. $\square$

Proposition 4.2.7. *Let $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} \mu_i p^i \in X_f(\mathbf{T})$ be a weight such that $\mu_i \in B$ is 8-deep for all i and $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_s(\mu^{\text{op}} + \eta - \underline{1})$. Set $\sigma^{\text{op}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mu)$ and let $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\lambda) \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be the unique constituent at maximal graph distance. Let τ^{σ} be an $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice in τ with irreducible cosocle isomorphic to σ . There exists a nonzero morphism $\iota : \bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes}$.*

Note that the map ι is unique up to scalar, as there is a unique up to scalar non-zero morphism $\text{Proj}(\sigma) \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes}$ by Lemma 4.2.6.

Proof. We first note that there exists a unique up to scalar nonzero map $\text{Proj}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ which is necessarily a surjection because it induces an isomorphism on cosocles. Similarly, since $\sigma^{\text{op}} \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}^{\sigma})$, there is a unique up to scalar nonzero map $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow \text{Inj}(\sigma^{\text{op}}) \cong \text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}})$. We conclude that the composition

$$(4.30) \quad \text{Proj}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow \text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}})$$

is nonzero.

We are left to prove that the composite map (4.30) factors through the embedding

$$(4.31) \quad V_{\mu, \otimes} \xhookrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}})$$

or, in other words, that the composite of (4.30) with the natural projection $\text{Proj}(\sigma^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow \text{coker}(\alpha)$ is zero. As formation of cosocle is right exact, and $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ has irreducible cosocle isomorphic to σ , the image of the composite map $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow \text{coker}(\alpha)$ is either zero, or has irreducible cosocle σ . By Lemma 4.2.6, we know that σ is not a Jordan-Hölder constituent of $\text{coker}(\alpha)$ and therefore $\text{Hom}_G(\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}, \text{coker}(\alpha)) = 0$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2.1. Let $I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Im}(\bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes})$ with filtration induced from the filtration $\text{Fil}_{\bullet}^{\otimes}$ on $V_{\mu, \otimes}$. We show by induction on $d = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma')$ that $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ is a Jordan-Hölder factor of $I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Im}(\bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \rightarrow V_{\mu, \otimes})$, and furthermore contributes to $\text{gr}_{3f-d}^{\otimes} I$.

The weight σ appears in $\text{gr}_{3f}^{\otimes} I$ by Lemma 4.2.6 and Proposition 4.2.7. Suppose that $d \geq 1$. There exists a weight σ'' such that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma'') = d - 1$ and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma', \sigma'') = 1$. Then σ'' appears in $\text{gr}_{3f-d+1}^{\otimes} I$ by the induction hypothesis. It follows that $\text{Im}(Q_{\sigma}(\sigma'') \rightarrow I)$ projects to σ'' in $\text{gr}_{3f-d+1}^{\otimes} I \subset \text{gr}_{3f-d+1}^{\otimes} V_{\mu, \otimes}$. By Theorem 4.2.2(3), the image of $\text{Im}(Q_{\sigma}(\sigma'') \rightarrow I)$ admits a non-zero map to the non-split extension of σ'' by σ' . It follows σ' appears in $\text{gr}_{3f-d'}^{\otimes} I$ for $d' \geq d$. By Theorem 4.2.2(2), $d' = d$.

Thus we have shown that $\bar{\tau}^\sigma \cong I$, and the layers of the filtration induced from $\text{Fil}_\bullet^\otimes$ is given by the extension graph. To conclude, it suffices to show that this induced filtration is the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$. For this, it suffices to show that $\text{Fil}_{3f-d}^\otimes I$ has cosocle $\text{gr}_{3f-d}^\otimes I$. The statement is obviously true for $d = 0$, so we suppose $d > 0$. Given the inductive hypothesis, we only need to show that $\text{Fil}_{3f-d}^\otimes I$ does not surject to any σ' such that $d' = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma') > d$. Suppose there is such a surjection. As above, pick $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma'') = d' - 1 \geq d$ and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma', \sigma'') = 1$, and there exists a submodule $M \subset \text{Fil}_{3f-d'+1}^\otimes I$ which surjects to the non-split extension of σ'' by σ' . But then the composition of the inclusion $M \hookrightarrow \text{Fil}_{3f-d}^\otimes I$ with the surjection $\text{Fil}_{3f-d}^\otimes I \twoheadrightarrow \sigma'$ gives a surjection $M \twoheadrightarrow \sigma''$, which contradicts the fact that M surjects to the non-split extension of σ'' by σ' . $\square$

4.3. Proof of the structure theorem in the general case. The aim of this section is to deduce Theorem 4.1.2 from the particular case in Theorem 4.2.1. To this aim, we introduce a third notion of distance (namely, the saturation distance cf. §4.3.1). The first step is to show an inequality between the graph and saturation distances (cf. Proposition 4.3.4) and then proceed further (cf. §4.3.2) to prove that under appropriate conditions on $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ (i.e. when σ is *maximally saturated*) the notions of graph, saturation, and cosocle distances actually coincide (Proposition 4.3.10). The agreement of the three distances is equivalent to Theorem 4.1.2, taking into account Lemma 4.3.6. In §4.3.3, we show that all weights are maximally saturated, thus concluding the proof of Theorem 4.1.2.

4.3.1. Various definitions of distances. In what follows, τ is a tame K -type. In this section, we introduce a third notion of distance on the set $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and give a comparison result with the graph distance (Corollary 4.3.4). To do this, we will make crucial use of a *global* input (Proposition 4.3.3). We also use these results to deduce some basic results including the result that if the Loewy strata of τ^σ are predicted by the extension graph, then so is the Alperin diagram.

Definition 4.3.1. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. Let τ^{σ_1} be an $\mathcal{O}$ -lattice with irreducible cosocle σ_1 and fix a saturated inclusion of lattices $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$. The *saturation distance* (with respect to τ), $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$, between σ_1 and σ_2 is defined to be the unique integer d such that $p^d \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_2}$ is a saturated inclusion.

The following Lemma is clear:

Lemma 4.3.2. *The saturation distance is a distance function on $\text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$.*

The following proposition is the main global input.

Proposition 4.3.3. *Let τ be a 4-generic type. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathrm{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be such that $d_{\mathrm{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = 1$. Then $d_{\mathrm{sat}}(\sigma_2, \sigma_1) = 1$.*

Proof. We can and do fix a semisimple Galois representation $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\ell(\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}, \tau)_i) \geq 2$ for all $i \neq 0$ and σ_1 and $\sigma_2 \in W^?(\bar{\rho}, \tau)$. Choose a suitable globalization $\bar{\tau}$ of $\bar{\rho}$ in the sense of [EG14, Appendix A]. For a place $v|p$, let $\bar{\rho}_v = \bar{\tau}|_{D_v}$. By [LLHLM, Proposition 7.15], there exists a weak minimal patching functor M_∞ , which we now fix.

Fix a place $v|p$. For $v'|p$ and $v' \neq v$, let $\tau_{v'}$ be a type such that $\ell(\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{v'}, \tau_{v'})_i) = 4$ for all i . Let $\tau^v = \bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+, v' \neq v} \tau_{v'}$ and fix a lattice $\tau^\circ \subset \tau^v$. Let $\tau_v = \tau$. We let $R'_\infty(\tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} R_\infty \hat{\otimes}_{(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_{v'}}^\square)} \left(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_{v'}, \mathbf{w}_{v'}}^{\tau_{v'}, \bar{\beta}_{v'}, \square} \right)$. Note that $\mathrm{Spf} R'_\infty(\tau)$ is formally smooth over $\mathrm{Spf} \left(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_{v'}, \mathbf{w}_{v'}}^{\mathrm{expl}, \nabla} \right)$, and hence is formally smooth over R as in Lemma 3.5.6. We consider $R'_\infty(\tau)$ as both an R -algebra and a $\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_{v'}}^\square$ -algebra.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ define the modules

$$\begin{aligned} M'_\infty(\tau^{\sigma_i}) &\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} M_\infty(\tau^\circ \otimes \tau^{\sigma_i}) \hat{\otimes}_{(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_{v'}}^\square)} \left(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_{v'}, \mathbf{w}_{v'}}^{\tau_{v'}, \bar{\beta}_{v'}, \square} \right) \\ M'_\infty(\sigma_i) &\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} M_\infty(\bar{\tau}^\circ \otimes \sigma_i) \hat{\otimes}_{(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\rho}_{v'}}^\square)} \left(\bigotimes_{v' \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_{v'}, \mathbf{w}_{v'}}^{\tau_{v'}, \bar{\beta}_{v'}, \square} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then $M'_\infty(\tau^{\sigma_i})$ is p -torsion free and maximally Cohen-Macaulay over $R'_\infty(\tau)$, and generically of rank one, and similarly $M'_\infty(\sigma_i)$ is maximally Cohen-Macaulay over $\bar{R}'_\infty(\tau)$.

By Proposition 3.5.1(2), $\mathrm{Ann}_{R'_\infty(\tau)}(M'_\infty(\sigma_i))$ is $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma_i)R'_\infty(\tau)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume without loss of generality that $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma_1)R'_\infty(\tau)$ is $((x_j)_{j=1}^N + (p))R'_\infty(\tau)$. Let $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma_2)R'_\infty(\tau)$ be $((z_j)_{j=1}^N + (p))R'_\infty(\tau)$, where $z_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}$ for all j . Then by Lemma 3.5.6, $\#(\{x_j\}_j \Delta \{z_j\}_j) = 2$. We assume without loss of generality that $z_1 = y_1$ and $z_j = x_j$ for $j \neq 1$.

To simplify notation, let $\tau_i = \tau^{\sigma_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. We fix a chain of saturated inclusion of lattices $p^k \tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2 \subseteq \tau_1$ with $k \geq 1$. Since τ is residually multiplicity free, $C \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{coker}(\tau_2 + p\tau_1 \hookrightarrow \tau_1)$ does not contain σ_2 as a Jordan–Hölder factor. By Lemma 3.5.2, the scheme theoretic support of $M'_\infty(C)$ is a closed subscheme of $\mathrm{Spec} R'_\infty(\tau) / \cap_{\sigma \neq \sigma_2} \mathfrak{p}^{\mathrm{expl}}(\sigma)R'_\infty(\tau)$. Note that $x_1 y_2 \cdots y_N \in \mathfrak{p}^{\mathrm{expl}}(\sigma)R'_\infty(\tau)$ for all $\sigma \neq \sigma_2$. We conclude that $x_1 y_2 \cdots y_N$ annihilates $M'_\infty(C)$, or equivalently

$$x_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\tau_1) \subset M'_\infty(\tau_2) + p M'_\infty(\tau_1).$$

Symmetrically, we have

$$y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\tau_2) \subset M'_\infty(p^k \tau_1) + p M'_\infty(\tau_2).$$

Combining these, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 y_2 \cdots y_N y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\tau_1) &\subset y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\tau_2) + y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N p M'_\infty(\tau_1) \\ &\subset M'_\infty(p^k \tau_1) + p M'_\infty(\tau_2) + y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N p M'_\infty(\tau_1). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying and cancelling p , we have

$$y_2^2 \cdots y_N^2 M'_\infty(\tau_1) \subset p^{k-1} M'_\infty(\tau_1) + M'_\infty(\tau_2) + y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\tau_1).$$

Assume $k > 1$. Then projecting via $M'_\infty(\tau_1) \twoheadrightarrow M'_\infty(\bar{\tau}_1) \twoheadrightarrow M'_\infty(\sigma_1)$, we have the inclusion

$$y_2^2 \cdots y_N^2 M'_\infty(\sigma_1) \subset y_1 y_2 \cdots y_N M'_\infty(\sigma_1).$$

This is a contradiction, since $M'_\infty(\sigma_1)$ is free over (a power series ring over) $\mathbb{F}[[y_1, \dots, y_N]]$, being maximal Cohen-Macaulay over it. $\square$

We deduce the following inequality:

Corollary 4.3.4. *Assume that τ is 4-generic and let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. Then $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \geq d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$, the case $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = 1$ being covered by Proposition 4.3.3. Pick a weight $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ distinct from σ_1 and σ_2 such that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \kappa) + d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa, \sigma_2) = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. We may and do fix saturated inclusions of lattices $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^\kappa$ and $\tau^\kappa \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$. By induction we have $p^{d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa, \sigma_2)} \tau^\kappa \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_2}$ and $p^{d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \kappa)} \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^\kappa$ which yields

$$(4.32) \quad p^{d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$$

(note that the composite inclusion $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$ need not be saturated). It follows in particular from (4.32) that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \geq d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. $\square$

We conclude this section showing that, under appropriate genericity conditions on the type τ , the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph if its Loewy strata are predicted by the extension graph (which is a strictly weaker assumption, *a priori*).

Lemma 4.3.5. *Assume that τ is 4-generic. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be such that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = 1$. Let us fix $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ as well as two saturated inclusions of lattices $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ and $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$. Then either $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$ or $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_2}$.*

Proof. We have $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_1) = 1$ by Proposition 4.3.3. Hence there exists integers $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$(4.33) \quad p^{k_1+1}\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq p^{k_1}\tau^{\sigma_1}$$

$$(4.34) \quad p^{k_2+1}\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p^{k_2}\tau^{\sigma_2}$$

are chain of saturated inclusions of lattices.

From (4.33) and the inclusion $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma}$, we have $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq p^{k_1}\tau^{\sigma}$; as moreover $\tau^{\sigma_2} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma}$ is saturated we necessarily have $k_1 \leq 0$. The analogous argument using (4.34) shows that $k_2 \leq 0$.

From (4.33), we deduce $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p^{-k_1-1}\tau^{\sigma_2}$ and hence $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p^{-k_1-1}\tau^{\sigma}$. As $\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma}$ is saturated we necessarily have $-k_1 - 1 \leq 0$. The analogous argument using (4.34) shows that $-k_2 - 1 \leq 0$. It follows that exactly one of k_1 or k_2 is 0. $\square$

Lemma 4.3.6. *Assume that τ is 4-generic and let $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. If the Loewy strata of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ are predicted by the extension graph, then the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$ is predicted by the extension graph.*

Proof. We show that in Definition 4.1.1, item (1) implies item (2). Let us fix adjacent constituents $\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1} \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ such that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_i) = i$, $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_{i+1}) = i + 1$. Note that by (1) we have $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_i) = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_i)$ and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_{i+1}) = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_{i+1})$. Let us fix saturated inclusions $\tau^{\sigma_i}, \tau^{\sigma_{i+1}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma}$. By Lemma 4.3.5 and reducing mod p , we either have $\sigma_i \in \text{JH}(Q_{\sigma}(\sigma_{i+1}))$ or $\sigma_{i+1} \in \text{JH}(Q_{\sigma}(\sigma_i))$. However, the former inclusion is ruled out by Lemma 4.1.17. Since $\sigma_{i+1} \in \text{JH}(Q_{\sigma}(\sigma_i))$, again by Lemma 4.1.17, we have

$$i + 1 = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_{i+1}) \geq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma}(\sigma_i) + d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_i}(\sigma_{i+1}) = i + d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_i}(\sigma_{i+1}).$$

This implies that σ_{i+1} appears in the first layer of the cosocle filtration of $Q_{\sigma}(\sigma_i)$ and the conclusion follows from Lemma 4.1.16(1). $\square$

4.3.2. Distances equalities. In this subsection, we define when a weight $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ is maximally saturated. Crucially using Lemma 4.1.10, we show that if σ is maximally saturated then the graph, saturation and cosocle distances from σ are equal, and therefore the structure Theorem 4.1.2 holds for $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$. From now on, we assume that the type τ is 10-generic (hence 8-deep).

From Proposition 2.2.7 and the definition of defect (cf. Definition 2.1) it follows that

$$(4.35) \quad \max \{d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa), \kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})\} = 3f - \text{Def}(\sigma).$$

Furthermore, if $\text{Def}(\sigma) = 0$ then there is a unique σ^{op} which has maximal graph distance from σ .

Definition 4.3.7. Let $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. We say that the weight σ is *maximally saturated* in τ if the following property holds:

$$(4.36) \quad \text{If } \kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}) \text{ verifies } d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = 3f - \text{Def}(\sigma) \text{ then } d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa) = 3f - \text{Def}(\sigma).$$

The following proposition motivates Definition 4.3.7.

Proposition 4.3.8. *A weight $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ is maximally saturated if and only if $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa)$ for all $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$.*

Proof. The “if” part is clear. Let $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be any weight and write $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa)$. Let $\sigma_{\text{max}} \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be a weight such that $d_{\text{max}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_{\text{max}}) = 3f - \text{Def}(\sigma)$ is maximal. We can arrange so that there is a path $(\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{d_{\text{max}}})$ in the extension graph of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ such that $\sigma_0 = \sigma$, $\sigma_{d_{\text{max}}} = \sigma_{\text{max}}$, $\sigma_d = \kappa$ and moreover $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_i, \sigma_0) = i$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d_{\text{max}}\}$. Note that, in particular, $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{\text{max}}, \kappa) = d_{\text{max}} - d$.

Let $\tau^\kappa \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ be a saturated inclusion of lattices. By definition, we have a chain of saturated inclusions:

$$(4.37) \quad p^{d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa)} \tau^\sigma \subseteq \tau^\kappa \subseteq \tau^\sigma.$$

As $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_{\text{max}}, \kappa) \leq d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{\text{max}}, \kappa) = d_{\text{max}} - d$ (Corollary 4.3.4), we further have an inclusion

$$(4.38) \quad p^{d_{\text{max}} - d} \tau^\kappa \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{\text{max}}}$$

(which *a priori* is not necessarily saturated). Combining (4.37) and (4.38), we have

$$p^{d_{\text{max}} - d + d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa)} \tau^\sigma \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{\text{max}}}$$

and hence

$$(4.39) \quad d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_{\text{max}}) \leq d_{\text{max}} - d + d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa) = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_{\text{max}}) - d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) + d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa).$$

As σ is maximally saturated we deduce from (4.39) that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) \leq d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa)$. The reverse inequality being granted by Corollary 4.3.4 we conclude that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \kappa) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \kappa)$, as required. $\square$

The following lemma is key in relating the notions of saturation and cosocle distance.

Lemma 4.3.9 (“Covering” Lemma). *Let $d \leq \ell(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$ and let*

$$\sigma_d \leftarrow \sigma_{d-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma$$

be an extension path of starting point σ and length $d + 1$ in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ let us fix a saturated inclusion $\tau^{\sigma_i} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$. Then we have a chain of (saturated) inclusions

$$\tau^{\sigma_d} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_0}.$$

Proof. The proof is an induction on d , the case $d = 1$ following from the fact that two representations have a non-trivial extension with each other iff they are adjacent in the extension graph.

As for the general case, the inductive hypothesis provides us with a chain of saturated inclusions $\tau^\sigma \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_1} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}}$. By Lemma 4.3.5, we either have $\tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_d}$ or $\tau^{\sigma_d} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}}$ and we are therefore left to rule out the inclusion $\tau^{\sigma_d} \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}}$. For $i \in \{d-1, d\}$, the image of the composition

$$\tau^{\sigma_i} \hookrightarrow \tau^\sigma \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\tau}^\sigma$$

is non-zero, hence identified with the subrepresentation $Q_\sigma(\sigma_i)$ of Lemma 4.1.16. If $\tau^{\sigma_d} \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}}$ then we would have $Q_\sigma(\sigma_d) \supseteq Q_\sigma(\sigma_{d-1})$, in particular $\sigma_{d-1} \in \text{JH}(Q_\sigma(\sigma_d))$. This implies that $d-1 = d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_{d-1}) > d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_d) = d$ by Lemma 4.1.17, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Thanks to the covering Lemma, we can show that all three notions of distance from σ agree in some particular situations.

Proposition 4.3.10. *If $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ is maximally saturated, then the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ is predicted by the extension graph.*

Proof. Assume that σ is maximally saturated. By Lemma 4.3.6, it suffices to show that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma') = d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma')$ for all $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. Let $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and $d = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma')$. We have that $\text{Hom}_G(\sigma', \text{gr}^k(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)) \neq 0$ for some $k \geq d$ by Corollary 4.1.15. Assume by contradiction that $k > d$. By the very definition of cosocle filtration we may, and do, fix an extension path (of starting point σ and length $k + 1$) in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$:

$$\kappa = \sigma_k \leftarrow \sigma_{k-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_0$$

such that $\sigma_0 = \sigma$ and $\sigma_k = \sigma'$. Since $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_k) = d < k$ there exists an index $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ such that

- (1) $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_i) = i$ and
- (2) $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{i+1}) < i + 1$.

Moreover, since the extension graph is bipartite, we have that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{i+1}) \leq i - 1$. By Lemma 4.3.9, there is a chain of saturated inclusions:

$$\tau^{\sigma_{i+1}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_i} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$$

where, in particular, $\tau^{\sigma_i} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ is saturated as well. As $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{i+1}) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{i+1}) \leq i - 1$ we further have $p^{i-1}\tau^\sigma \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{i+1}}$. We conclude that $p^{i-1}\tau^\sigma \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_i} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ hence $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_i) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_i) \leq i - 1$, contradicting (1). $\square$

We now use Theorem 4.2.1 to prove that lower alcove weights of defect zero are maximally saturated.

Proposition 4.3.11. *Let τ be a 8-deep type and let $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ be a constituent with $\text{Def}(\sigma) = 0$. Assume that $\sigma = \otimes_{i=0}^{f-1} F(\lambda_i)^{[i]}$ where $\lambda_i \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ is a p -restricted and lower alcove weight for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$. Then σ is maximally saturated in $\bar{\tau}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2.1, we can and do fix an extension path in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$, with starting point $\sigma_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma$ and length $3f$: $\sigma^{\text{op}} = \sigma_{3f} \leftarrow \sigma_{3f-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_0$. By Lemma 4.3.9 we have a sequence of saturated inclusions:

$$\tau^\sigma \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_1} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \tau^{\sigma_{3f-1}} \supseteq \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$$

where $\tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ is itself saturated. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, 3f-1\}$ let $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ be the unique integer such that $p^{n_i}\tau^{\sigma_i} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ is a saturated inclusion of lattices. Note that $n_i \leq 3f - i$ for all i by Corollary 4.3.4.

Applying Theorem 4.2.1 to the lattice in the dual type with cosocle $\sigma^\vee$, and noting that the reduction of the dual of a lattice is the dual of the reduction of a lattice, we see that the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ is predicted by the extension graph. In particular, $\sigma_0 \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_{3f-1} \leftarrow \sigma_{3f} = \sigma^{\text{op}}$ is an extension path in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ and hence, from Lemma 4.3.9 we deduce a chain of (saturated) inclusions

$$\tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}} \supseteq p^{n_{3f-1}}\tau^{\sigma_{3f-1}} \supseteq \dots \supseteq p^{n_1}\tau^{\sigma_1} \supseteq p^{n_0}\tau^\sigma$$

where we necessarily have $n_{i-1} > n_i$ for all i (as $\tau^{\sigma_{i+1}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_i}$ is saturated). In particular $n_0 \geq 3f$, hence $n_0 = 3f$ and $n_i = 3f - i$ for all i . $\square$

4.3.3. Induction on defect. In this subsection, we show inductively that all weights are maximally saturated, starting from lower alcove weights as in Proposition 4.3.11. We conclude the section with the proof of Theorem 4.1.2. We first start with the defect zero case.

Lemma 4.3.12. *Let τ be a 8-deep type. If $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ and $\text{Def}(\sigma) = 0$, then σ is maximally saturated.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.3.11, there exists $\sigma_0 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ such that $\text{Def}(\sigma_0) = 0$ and σ_0 is maximally saturated. Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ with $\text{Def}(\sigma_1) = 0$. We induct on the distance $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$, the

case of $d = 0$ holding as noted above. Suppose that $d > 0$. Then there exists a $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ such that $\text{Def}(\sigma) = 0$, $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_0, \sigma) = d - 1$, and $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_1) = 1$. Then σ is maximally saturated by the induction hypothesis.

By Proposition 4.3.10, since σ (resp. σ^{op}) are maximally saturated, the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ (resp. $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$) is predicted by the extension graph. Hence we may and do choose two extension paths, of starting point σ in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^\sigma$ of the form: $\sigma^{\text{op}} \leftarrow \sigma'_{3f-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma'_2 \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma$ and $\sigma^{\text{op}} \leftarrow \sigma_1^{\text{op}} \leftarrow \sigma''_{3f-2} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma''_1 \leftarrow \sigma$ where $\sigma'_i, \sigma''_i \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}^\sigma)$. As the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ is predicted by the extension graph, the extension paths above induce extensions paths in $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ by “reversing the arrows and the endpoints”. Let us fix saturated inclusions of lattices $\tau^{\sigma'_i}, \tau^{\sigma''_i} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$, $\tau^{\sigma_1}, \tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$. Since σ and σ^{op} are maximally saturated, we deduce that $p^{3f-i}\tau^{\sigma'_i}, p^{3f-i}\tau^{\sigma''_i} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$, $p^{3f-1}\tau^{\sigma_1}, p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ are saturated inclusions as well.

By Lemma 4.3.9 we deduce the following chain of saturated inclusions:

(4.40)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & p^{3f-1}\tau^{\sigma_1} & \subseteq & \dots & \subseteq & p\tau^{\sigma'_{3f-1}} & & \tau^{\sigma'_{3f-1}} & \subseteq & \dots & \subseteq & \tau^{\sigma_1} \\
 & & \lhd & & & & \lhd & & \lhd & & & & \lhd \\
 p^{3f}\tau^{\sigma_1} & \subseteq & p^{3f}\tau^\sigma & & & & \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}} & & & & & & \tau^\sigma \\
 & & \lhd & & & & \lhd & & \lhd & & & & \lhd \\
 & & p^{3f-1}\tau^{\sigma_1''} & \subseteq & \dots & \subseteq & p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} & & \tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} & \subseteq & \dots & \subseteq & \tau^{\sigma_1''}
 \end{array}$$

We aim to show that the inclusions $p^{3f}\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}}$ and $p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$, obtained by composing the saturated inclusions above, are saturated.

We first show that $p^{3f}\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}}$ is saturated. If not, then we obtain a chain of saturated inclusion $p^{3f-1}\tau^{\sigma_1} \subseteq p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$. We deduce that σ_1 is a constituent in image $Q_{\sigma^{\text{op}}}(\sigma_1^{\text{op}})$ and hence $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma^{\text{op}}}(\sigma_1) \geq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma^{\text{op}}}(\sigma_1^{\text{op}}) + d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_1^{\text{op}}}(\sigma_1) \geq d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma^{\text{op}}, \sigma_1^{\text{op}}) + d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_1^{\text{op}}, \sigma_1) \geq 3f + 1$ by Corollary 4.1.15 and Lemma 4.1.17. On the other hand, as the Alperin diagram of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma^{\text{op}}}$ is predicted by the extension graph we have that $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma^{\text{op}}}(\sigma_1) = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma^{\text{op}}, \sigma_1) = 3f - 1$ contradiction.

The evident analogue of the previous argument shows that $p\tau^{\sigma_1^{\text{op}}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_1}$ is saturated as well. Hence $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_1^{\text{op}}) = 3f$. $\square$

We now give the induction argument.

Proposition 4.3.13. *Let τ be a 8-deep K -type. Then any constituent $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ is maximally saturated in $\bar{\tau}$.*

Proof. We induct on the defect $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Def}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$. The case $\delta = 0$ holds by Lemma 4.3.12. Suppose that $\delta > 0$. To ease notation, let $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 3f - \delta$ and pick a weight $\sigma_d \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ such that

$d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_d) = d$ (in other words σ_d is a weight at maximal graph distance from σ); we will show that $d = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_d)$. Note that $\text{Def}(\sigma_d) \leq \text{Def}(\sigma)$. If $\text{Def}(\sigma_d) < \text{Def}(\sigma)$ then σ_d is maximally saturated (by induction on $\text{Def}(\sigma_d)$) and hence $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma, \sigma_d) = d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_d)$ by Proposition 4.3.8.

We now consider the case $\text{Def}(\sigma_d) = \text{Def}(\sigma)$. By a direct check on the extension graph, we see that there exists $\sigma_{d-1} \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ with $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_d, \sigma_{d-1}) = 1$ and $\text{Def}(\sigma_{d-1}) = \text{Def}(\sigma) - 1$. Note that $d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{d-1}, \sigma) = d - 1$. By induction, the weight σ_{d-1} is maximally saturated, hence $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma_{d-1}, \kappa) = d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{d-1}, \kappa) = d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_{d-1}}(\kappa)$ for all $\kappa \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau})$ by Proposition 4.3.10.

Let $\tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$, $\tau^{\sigma_d} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$ be saturated inclusions of lattices. By Lemma 4.3.5, we are in one of the following situations:

- (1) $\tau^{\sigma_d} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$;
- (2) $\tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \subseteq \tau^{\sigma_d} \subseteq \tau^\sigma$.

where the inclusions are all saturated.

Case (1). Taking $\kappa = \sigma$ in the above, we have that $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_{d-1}) = d - 1$, and hence obtain chains of saturated inclusions:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} p^{d-1}\tau^\sigma & \subseteq & \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} & \subseteq & \tau^\sigma \\ & & \cup & & \\ & & \tau^{\sigma_d} & & \end{array}$$

Assume by contradiction that $d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_d) < d$, i.e. that we have a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} p^{d-1}\tau^\sigma & \subseteq & \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} & \subseteq & \tau^\sigma \\ & \searrow & \cup & & \\ & & \tau^{\sigma_d} & & \end{array}$$

We obtain a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} p^{d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_d)}\tau^\sigma & \hookrightarrow & \tau^{\sigma_d} & \hookrightarrow & \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (p^{d_{\text{sat}}(\sigma, \sigma_d)}\tau^\sigma) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbb{F} & \xrightarrow{\neq 0} & \bar{\tau}^{\sigma_d} & \xrightarrow{\neq 0} & \bar{\tau}^{\sigma_{d-1}} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \neq 0 & & \end{array}$$

where the lower arrows are all *non-zero*.

In particular, σ is a constituent of $Q_{\sigma_{d-1}}(\sigma_d)$. By Corollary 4.1.15 and Lemma 4.1.17, we have $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_{d-1}}(\sigma) \geq d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_{d-1}}(\sigma_d) + d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_d}(\sigma) \geq d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{d-1}, \sigma_d) + d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_d, \sigma) = d + 1$. On the other hand, as σ_{d-1} is maximally saturated, $d_{\text{csc}, \sigma_{d-1}}(\sigma) = d - 1$, a contradiction.

Case (2). We now have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \tau^{\sigma_{d-1}} & \hookrightarrow & \tau^{\sigma_d} & \hookrightarrow & \tau^{\sigma} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \bar{\tau}^{\sigma_{d-1}} & \xrightarrow{\neq 0} & \bar{\tau}^{\sigma_d} & \xrightarrow{\neq 0} & \bar{\tau}^{\sigma} \\
 & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\
 & & \neq 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

where again the lower arrows are *non-zero*. Exactly as in the previous case, we deduce that $d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_{d-1}) \geq d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_d) + 1 \geq d + 1$.

We therefore may, and do, fix an extension path (of starting point σ and length $k + 1$ where $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{\text{csc},\sigma}(\sigma_{d-1})$) in the cosocle filtration of $\bar{\tau}^{\sigma}$:

$$\sigma_k \leftarrow \sigma_{k-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_0$$

where $\sigma_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{d-1}$, $\sigma_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma$. For notational convenience, we set $\kappa_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{k-i}$. As $k \geq d + 1$, and as σ_{d-1} is maximally saturated, we deduce as in the proof of Proposition 4.3.10 the existence of an index $i \in \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$ such that

- (1) $d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa_0, \kappa_i) = d_{\text{sat}}(\kappa_0, \kappa_i) = i$ and
- (2) $d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa_0, \kappa_{i+1}) = d_{\text{sat}}(\kappa_0, \kappa_{i+1}) < i + 1$, and actually $d_{\text{gph}}(\kappa_0, \kappa_{i+1}) \leq i - 1$.

The second item implies that $\tau^{\kappa_0} \subseteq \tau^{\kappa_{i+1}} \subseteq p^{-i+1}\tau^{\kappa_0}$. The induced inclusion $\tau^{\kappa_i} \subseteq \tau^{\kappa_{i+1}} \subseteq p^{-i+1}\tau^{\kappa_0}$ contradicts the first item. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.1.2. The second statement follows from Propositions 4.3.8 and 4.3.13. The first statement follows from Propositions 4.3.10 and 4.3.13. $\square$


TABLE 8. Comparison between alcoves C_i , affine Weyl group elements $\tilde{w}_i^*$ and the graph.

$\tilde{w}_i^*$	$\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$	$p\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*$	$\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot A$	$(\omega, a)_i$
id	id	$pt_{\underline{0}}$	A	$(0, 0)$
$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$pt_{\underline{0}}$	B	$(0, 1)$
$(123)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	$(123)t_{-p\omega_2}$	pt_{ω_2}	C	$(s(\omega_2), 0); s \in S_3$
$(12)t_{p\alpha_2}$	$(12)t_{-p(\omega_1-\omega_2-\underline{1})}$	pt_{ω_2}	E	$(s(\omega_2), 1); s \in S_3$
$(132)t_{-p\alpha_1}$	$(132)t_{-p\omega_1}$	pt_{ω_1}	D	$(s(\omega_1), 0); s \in S_3$
$(23)t_{p\alpha_1}$	$(23)t_{-p(\omega_2-\omega_1+\underline{1})}$	pt_{ω_1}	F	$(s(\omega_1), 1); s \in S_3$
$(13)t_{-2p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$pt_{\omega_1+\omega_2}$	J	$(s(\omega_1 + \omega_2), 1); s \in S_3$

$\tilde{w}_i^*$	$\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$	$p\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*$	$\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot B$	$(\omega, a)_i$
id	id	$pt_{\underline{0}}$	B	$(0, 1)$
$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$pt_{\underline{0}}$	A	$(0, 0)$
$(132)t_{-p(2\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	$(132)t_{-p(2\omega_1-\underline{1})}$	pt_{ω_2}	E	$(s(\omega_2), 1); s \in S_3$
$(23)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	$(23)t_{-p\omega_2}$	pt_{ω_2}	C	$(s(\omega_2), 0); s \in S_3$
$(123)t_{-p(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2)}$	$(123)t_{-p(2\omega_2+\underline{1})}$	pt_{ω_1}	F	$(s(\omega_1), 1); s \in S_3$
$(12)t_{-p\alpha_1}$	$(12)t_{-p\omega_2}$	pt_{ω_1}	D	$(s(\omega_1), 0); s \in S_3$
$(13)t_{-2p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$(13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$	$pt_{\omega_1+\omega_2}$	G	$(s(\omega_1 + \omega_2), 1); s \in S_3$

For each element $\tilde{w}_i^*$ in the first column, we consider the decomposition $\tilde{w}_i^* = (p\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*) \cdot \tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$ with $(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*)_i \in W_+$. In the fourth column we write the alcove containing $\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot A$. In the fifth column we write the i -th coordinate of the points in the graph (with origin $\mu + \eta - \underline{1}$) corresponding to an irreducible constituent of $(\otimes_i F(\tilde{w}_i^* \cdot \mu_i)^{[i]})|_G$.

Similar comments apply to the second half of the table. Note that in this case, we consider the decomposition $\tilde{w}_i^* = (p\tilde{w}_{i,-}^*) \cdot \tilde{w}_{i,+}^*$ with $(\tilde{w}_{i,+}^*)_i \in W_+ \cdot (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+\omega_2)}$.

TABLE 9. Alperin diagram of $V(\mu^{\text{op}} + p(\eta - \underline{1}))$


The Alperin diagrams of $V(\mu^{\text{op}} + p(\eta - \underline{1}))$ when $f = 1$. In the first (resp. second) diagram $\mu \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ is upper alcove (resp. lower alcove). For each alcove we write below the unique weight which is strongly linked to (x, y, z) . We remark that $\text{gr}_1^\otimes(V(\mu^{\text{op}} + p(\eta - \underline{1}))) = \text{gr}_1^\otimes(Q_1(\mu))$ if μ is upper alcove, while $\text{gr}_1^\otimes(V(\mu^{\text{op}} + p(\eta - \underline{1}))) \oplus L(\mu_1^{\text{op}}) = \text{gr}_1^\otimes(Q_1(\mu))$ if μ is lower alcove.

 TABLE 10. Relative position of $\tilde{z}_0^*$ with respect to $\tilde{w}_0^*, \tilde{y}_0^*$.

	$\tilde{y}_0^*$	$(13)t_{-p(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	$(23)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	$(12)t_{-p\alpha_1}$
$\tilde{w}_0^*$	$\tilde{y}_0^* \cdot \mu_0$	A	C	D
id	$\tilde{w}_0^* \cdot \mu_0$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = (13)t_{-p(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = (23)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = (12)t_{-p\alpha_1}$
	$\tilde{y}_0^*$	$(132)t_{-p(2\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	$(123)t_{-p(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2)}$	$(13)t_{-2p(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$
$\tilde{w}_0^*$	$\tilde{y}_0^* \cdot \mu_0$	E	F	G
$(13)t_{-p(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	A	$\tilde{z}_0^* = (132)t_{-p(2\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = (123)t_{-p(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2)}$	
$(23)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	C	$\tilde{z}_0^* = \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* = (132)t_{-p(2\omega_1-\underline{1})}$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = p^{t_{\omega_2}} \cdot \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* = (123)t_{-p(2\alpha_2+\omega_1-\omega_2)}$	
$(12)t_{-p\alpha_1}$	D	$\tilde{z}_0^* = p^{t_{\omega_1}} \cdot \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* = (132)t_{-p(2\alpha_1+\omega_2-\omega_1)}$	$\tilde{z}_0^* = \tilde{y}_{0,+}^* = (123)t_{-p(2\omega_2+\underline{1})}$	
$(123)t_{-p\alpha_2}$	E			$\tilde{z}_0^* = (13)t_{-p(\omega_1+2\omega_2)}$
$(132)t_{-p\alpha_1}$	F			$\tilde{z}_0^* = (13)t_{-p(2\omega_1+\omega_2)}$

We consider the affine Weyl group elements $\tilde{w}_0^*, \tilde{y}_0^*$. We are assuming that the p -restricted weight μ_0 is *upper alcove*. The $(\tilde{w}_0^*, \tilde{y}_0^*)$ -entry in the table describes the element $\tilde{z}_0^* = (p\tilde{z}_{0,-}^*)\tilde{y}_{0,+}^*$ such that $L(\tilde{z}_0^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]}$ is a direct summand constituent in $\text{gr}_1(Q_1(\tilde{w}_{0,+}^* \cdot \mu_0) \otimes L(\tilde{w}_{0,-}^*)^{[1]})$ containing $\text{gr}_1(M^{[0]})$.

5. BREUIL'S CONJECTURES

In this section, we deduce generalizations of Breuil's conjectures on mod p multiplicity one and lattices from the results in §3 - 4. In §5.1, we prove some results on ideals in deformation rings necessary for §5.2. In §5.2 - 5.3, we prove a version of Breuil's conjectures for abstract patching functors. Finally, we deduce the main results in §5.4.

5.1. Ideal relations in deformation rings. In this subsection, we calculate some sums of ideals in deformation rings, and in effect explicitly study the intersection theory of components in the special fiber. These computations play a crucial role in §5.2.

5.1.1. *id shape.* We begin with the *id* shape.

Lemma 5.1.1. *Let $\bar{\rho}_0 : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be semisimple with 2-generic inertial weights $(a, b, c) \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ and having shape *id* relative to τ_0 . Let $\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_0 \in Y_{\mathrm{id}}^{(2, 1, 0), \tau_0}(\mathbb{F})$ be the unique Kisin module such that $T_{dd'}^*(\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_0) = \bar{\rho}_0|_{G_{\mathbb{Q}_p\infty}}$.*

We the following equality of ideals in the ring $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_0, \mathrm{id}}^{\mathrm{expl}, \nabla}$:

$$(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2) + (\mathfrak{w}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3) = \mathfrak{w}_1.$$

Proof. An elementary check on the list of generators of the ideals $\mathfrak{w}_1$, $\mathfrak{l}_2$ and $\mathfrak{l}_3$ (cf. Table 6) shows that

$$\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \supseteq (c_{33}, c_{23}, c_{22}), \quad \mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3 \supseteq (c_{33}, c_{22}, c_{13}c_{32} - c_{12}),$$

in particular (again by looking at the list of generators of $\mathfrak{w}_1$) we have $(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2) + (\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3) \supseteq \mathfrak{w}_1$. The reverse inclusion is obvious. $\square$

Lemma 5.1.2. *Keep the assumption and notations of Lemma 5.1.1.*

In the ring $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}_0, \mathrm{id}}^{\mathrm{expl}, \nabla}$, we have the following relation:

$$\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3 = (c_{22}, c_{33}).$$

Proof. Recall the $\mathbb{F}$ -algebra $\tilde{R}$ of [LLHLM], §8.1. It has an explicit presentation as a quotient of the formal power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq 3]]$ and $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathrm{id}}^{\mathrm{expl}, \nabla}$ is formally smooth over $\tilde{R}$ (cf. [LLHLM], Proposition 8.2). It is therefore equivalent to work directly in $\tilde{R}$. From Table 6, we immediately obtain $(c_{22}, c_{33}) \subseteq \mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3$, and hence we need to prove that the surjection

$$(5.1) \quad \tilde{R}/(c_{22}, c_{33}) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{R}/(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3)$$

is an isomorphism.

An easy computation using [LLHLM], Proposition 8.2 shows that $\tilde{R}/(c_{22}, c_{33})$ is isomorphic to the quotient of the power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{11}, c_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j, \leq 3, i \neq j]]$ by the ideal generated by the following elements:

$$\begin{array}{lll} c_{11}c_{23}, & c_{12}c_{23}, & c_{11}c_{32} - c_{12}c_{31}, \\ c_{31}c_{23}, & c_{23}c_{32}, & \kappa c_{11} = c_{21}c_{12}, \\ c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, & c_{11} - c_{12}c_{21} - c_{13}c_{31} - c_{23}c_{32} + c_{21}c_{13}c_{32} & \end{array}$$

for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. By standard manipulations, we conclude that $\tilde{R}/(c_{22}, c_{33})$ is isomorphic to the quotient of the power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j, \leq 3, i \neq j]]$ by the ideal generated by the following elements:

$$\begin{array}{lll} c_{31}c_{23}, & c_{23}c_{32}, & c_{12}c_{23}, \\ c_{31}(c_{12} - c_{13}c_{32}), & c_{13}(\kappa c_{31} - c_{21}c_{32}), & c_{21}(c_{12} - c_{13}c_{32}) \end{array}$$

hence, by an evident change of variables,

$$\tilde{R}/(c_{22}, c_{33}) \cong \mathbb{F}[U, V, W, X, Y, Z]/(UV, UW, UY, VW, VX, WZ).$$

The latter ring is easily seen to be 3 dimensional, with 4 irreducible components. As $\tilde{R}/\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3$ is also equidimensional of dimension 3 (cf. [LLHLM], Proposition 8.3), we conclude that the image of the closed immersion

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Spec } (\tilde{R}/\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3) \hookrightarrow \text{Spec } (\tilde{R}/(c_{22}, c_{33}))$$

is a union of irreducible components. As $\text{Spec } (\tilde{R}/\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3)$ has 4 irreducible components by construction (cf. [LLHLM], Proposition 8.3), we conclude that (5.2) is indeed surjective, hence the kernel of (5.1) is nilpotent.

In order to prove that (5.1) is an isomorphism, we are thus left to show that

$$\mathbb{F}[U, V, W, X, Y, Z]/(UV, UW, UY, VW, VX, WZ)$$

is reduced. To this aim, we follow closely the argument used in [LLHLM], proof of Proposition 8.3. Let $I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (UV, UW, UY, VW, VX, WZ)$. Choosing the monomial order to be the standard lexicographical order, Buchberger's algorithm provides the elements UV, UW, UY, VW, VX, WZ as a Gröbner basis for the ideal I . In particular the initial ideal of I (which is I itself) is generated by square-free monomials, and this implies as in [LLHLM], proof of Proposition 8.3 that I is radical. $\square$

From Lemma 5.1.2, the same argument used in the proof of Lemma 5.1.1 gives the following:

Lemma 5.1.3. *Keep the assumption and notations of Lemma 5.1.1. We the following equality of ideals in the ring $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}_0, \text{id}}}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$:*

$$(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{w}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3) + (\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{w}_3 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2) = \mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3$$

Proof. From Table 6, we immediately deduce that $(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{w}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3) \supseteq (c_{33})$ and $(\mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{w}_3 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2) \supseteq (c_{22})$. The conclusion now follows as in Lemma 5.1.1 by noting that $(c_{22}, c_{33}) = \mathfrak{w}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3$. $\square$

5.1.2. α shape. We now do the analogous calculations for the α shape.

Lemma 5.1.4. *Let $\bar{\rho}_0 : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \rightarrow \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be semisimple with 2-generic inertial weights $(a, b, c) \in X_1(\mathbf{T})$ and having shape α relative to τ_0 . Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_0 \in Y_{\alpha}^{(2, 1, 0), \tau_0}(\mathbb{F})$ be the unique Kisin module such that $T_{dd'}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_0) = \bar{\rho}_0|_{G_{\mathbb{Q}_{p^\infty}}}$.*

Recall the minimal prime ideals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{u}_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}, (a - b)c_{31}c'_{22} + (c - b)\tilde{c}_{32}) \\ \mathfrak{u}_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_{11}, \tilde{c}_{32}, (a - b)c_{31}c'_{22} + (e - a + c)c_{23}) \end{aligned}$$

of $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_0, \alpha}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ (cf. [LLHLM], Proposition 8.9) and let $I_{\Lambda_0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{u}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2$.

Then

- (1) $I_{\Lambda_0} = (c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32})$,
- (2) $\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 = (c_{11}, c_{13}c_{31})$.

Proof. We recall the explicit ring $\tilde{R}$ from [LLHLM] §8.2.1: the ring $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_0, \alpha}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ is then formally smooth over $\tilde{R}$ by *loc. cit.* Proposition 8.9 and (3.7). It is therefore enough to work with $\tilde{R}$.

We start with (1). From table (6), we easily deduce

$$I_{\Lambda_0} \supseteq (c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32})$$

i.e. a surjection

$$(5.3) \quad \tilde{R}/(c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32}) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{R}/I_{\Lambda_0}$$

which we claim it is an isomorphism. Note that by construction the ring $\tilde{R}/I_{\Lambda_0}$ has three minimal primes, and it is equidimensional of dimension 3.

From [LLHLM] Proposition 8.7, we immediately deduce that the ring $\tilde{R}/(c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32})$ is isomorphic to the quotient of the power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{31}, c_{13}, c'_{22}, \tilde{c}_{32}, c_{23}]]$ by the ideal generated

by the following elements:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{13}c_{31}c_{23}, & & c_{13}c_{31}c'_{22} - \frac{b-c}{a-b}c_{13}\tilde{c}_{32}, & & c_{23}c_{31}, \\ c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32}, & & (a-b)c_{13}c_{31}c'_{22} + (c-b)c_{13}\tilde{c}_{32} + (-1-a+c)c_{23}c_{31} \end{aligned}$$

i.e. by the ideal generated by

$$c_{13}(c_{31}c'_{22} - \frac{b-c}{a-b}\tilde{c}_{32}), \quad c_{23}c_{31}, \quad c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32},$$

or equivalently, the ideal generated by

$$c_{13}(c_{31}c'_{22} - \frac{b-c}{a-b}\tilde{c}_{32}), \quad c_{23}c_{31}, \quad c_{23}(c_{31}c'_{22} - \frac{b-c}{a-b}\tilde{c}_{32}).$$

In other words, by an evident change of variables we have

$$\tilde{R}/(c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32}) \cong \mathbb{F}[[X, Y, Z, W, c'_{22}]]/(XY, YZ, WZ)$$

and the latter ring is equidimensional of dimension 3 and has 3 irreducible components. It is moreover reduced, as it can be checked using the very same argument used in the proof of Lemma 5.1.2 (computing a Gröbner basis with respect of the lexicographical order, and checking its elements are square-free).

The conclusion is as in the proof of Lemma 5.1.2. We have a closed immersion

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Spec}(\tilde{R}/I_{\Lambda_0}) \hookrightarrow \text{Spec}(\tilde{R}/(c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32}))$$

and since the source and the target are equidimensional of the same dimension, the image of (5.4) is a union of irreducible components. As image and source have the same number of irreducible components, it follows that (5.4) is indeed surjective, hence the kernel of (5.3) is nilpotent. As $\tilde{R}/(c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}, c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32})$ is reduced we conclude that (5.3) is an isomorphism, as required.

The argument to prove (2) is completely analogous and we only sketch the argument. It is immediate to obtain from Table 6 the inclusion $\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \supseteq (c_{11}, c_{13}c_{31})$. From [LLHLM], Proposition 8.7, we see that $\tilde{R}/(c_{11}, c_{13}c_{31})$ is isomorphic to the power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{13}, c_{23}, c_{31}, \tilde{c}_{32}, c'_{22}]]$ by the ideal generated by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{13}c_{31}, & & c_{13}\tilde{c}_{32}, \\ c_{31}c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32}, & & c_{31}(\kappa c_{23} - c_{13}c'_{22}) \end{aligned}$$

or, by further simplifying the redundancies, to the power series ring $\mathbb{F}[[c_{13}, c_{23}, c_{31}, \tilde{c}_{32}, c'_{22}]]$ by the ideal generated by

$$c_{13}c_{31}, \quad c_{13}\tilde{c}_{32}, \quad c_{31}(\kappa c_{23} - c_{13}c'_{22}).$$

The conclusion is obtained following the analogous argument as in the previous case. $\square$

Lemma 5.1.5. *We keep the notation and assumptions of Lemma 5.1.4. We have the following equality of ideals in $\overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}_0, \alpha}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$:*

$$(I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_{ob}) + (I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_{ob}) = I_{\Lambda_0}$$

$$(\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_1) + (\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_2) = \mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2.$$

Proof. An elementary check on the list of generators of the ideals I_{Λ_0} , $\mathfrak{u}_2$, $\mathfrak{l}_{ob}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_{ob}$ shows that

$$(I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_{ob}) \supseteq (c_{11} - c_{13}c_{31}, c_{23}c_{31}), \quad (I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_{ob}) \supseteq (c_{23}\tilde{c}_{32})$$

and we deduce (again by looking at the list of generators of I_{Λ_0}) that

$$(I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_{ob}) + (I_{\Lambda_0} \cap \mathfrak{u}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_{ob}) \supseteq I_{\Lambda_0}.$$

The reverse inclusion is obvious. Similarly, $(c_{11}) \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_2$ and $(c_{13}c_{31}) \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_1$. Hence $(\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_1) + (\mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{u}_2) \supseteq \mathfrak{u}_{ob} \cap \mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2$. $\square$

5.2. Cyclicity for patching functors. In this subsection, we show that certain patched modules for tame types are locally free of rank one over the corresponding local deformation space using several inductive steps. The base case is Lemma 5.2.3. Each inductive step uses one of two arguments in [EGS15, §10]. It is here that the results of §5.1 enter.

We go back to the weak minimal patching functor setting of §3.4. We consider a continuous Galois representation $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ and assume that a weak minimal patching functor M_∞ for $\bar{r}$ exists (cf. Definition 3.4.1). We let

$$R'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v) = R_\infty \widehat{\otimes}_{(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\rho_v}^\square)} \left(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\tau_v, \bar{\beta}_v, \square} \right)$$

and

$$M'_\infty(V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_\infty(V) \widehat{\otimes}_{(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\rho_v}^\square)} \left(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\tau_v, \bar{\beta}_v, \square} \right)$$

for any subquotient V of a lattice in $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$. Then $\text{Spf} \overline{R}'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ (resp. $\text{Spf} R'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$) is formally smooth over $\text{Spf} \left(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} \right)$ (resp. $\text{Spf} \left(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\text{expl}, \nabla} \right)$ when this is defined). We consider $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \overline{R}'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ (resp. $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$) both as a $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \overline{R}_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ -algebra and a $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \overline{R}_{\rho_v}^\square$ -algebra (resp. a $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\mathfrak{M}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ -algebra and a $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\rho_v}^\square$ -algebra). It is easy to see that $M'_\infty(V)$ is a cyclic R'_∞ -module if and only if $M_\infty(V)$ is a cyclic R_∞ -module. Moreover, $M'_\infty(V)$ is always maximal Cohen–Macaulay over its support. By abuse of notation, in this subsection, we write $M_\infty(V)$ and $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ for $M'_\infty(V)$ and $R'_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$. Hence every result in this subsection holds if M_∞ is replaced with any weak minimal patching functor.

Theorem 5.2.1. *For each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let $\tau_{\tilde{v}}$ be an inertial type and write $\mathbf{w}_v = \mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_{\tilde{v}}) = (\tilde{w}_{v,i})$ for the associated shape at the place $\tilde{v}$. For each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let $\sigma_v = \otimes_{i=0}^{f_v} F(\lambda_{v,i})^{[i]} \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_{\tilde{v}})$ satisfying the following property*

$$(5.5) \quad \lambda_{v,i-1} \in X_1(\mathbf{T}) \text{ is in alcove } B \text{ if } \ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \leq 1.$$

Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ is a cyclic R_∞ -module.

If V is a ϖ -torsion $\prod_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} K_v$ -representation satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 3.5.2, we write $R_\infty(V)$ to denote the quotient $R_\infty/I(V)$.

Lemma 5.2.2. *Assume that $\sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}})$ is an obvious weight for $\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}$ for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)$ is a cyclic $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ -module.*

Proof. The proof follows the methods of Diamond and Fujiwara ([Dia97]). Note that the support of $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)$ is formally smooth as can easily be checked from [LLHLM, §5.3.2 and 8]. Since $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)$ is maximal Cohen–Macaulay over its formally smooth support by Definition 3.4.1(2), it is free by the Auslander–Buchsbaum–Serre theorem and the Auslander–Buchsbaum formula. Since $e(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)) = 1$ by Theorem 3.4.3, the free rank is one. $\square$

We now move towards the proof of Theorem 5.2.1. For each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, we fix an inertial type $\tau_{\tilde{v}}$ and write $\mathbf{w}_v = \mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_{\tilde{v}}) = (\tilde{w}_{v,i})$ for the associated shape at the place $\tilde{v}$. Similarly, for each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, we have fixed $\sigma_v = \otimes_{i=0}^{f_v} F(\lambda_{v,i})^{[i]} \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_{\tilde{v}})$ satisfying property (5.5).

The proof of Theorem 5.2.1 proceeds by induction on the complexity of the submodule structure of $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$. We distinguish four steps in the induction argument.

Lemma 5.2.3. *Assume that $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) > 1$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, f_v - 1\}$ and all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$. For each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let V_v be a quotient of $\tau_v^{\sigma_v}$. Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is a cyclic $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ -module.*

Proof. One can check that for each $v \in \Sigma_p^+$ there is a unique weight $\sigma'_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_v)$ such that $\text{d}_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_v, \sigma'_v)$ is minimal. By Theorem 4.1.2, we have a unique (up to scalar) non-zero map $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v} \rightarrow \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}$ and the induced map $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v}) \rightarrow M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ is an isomorphism by Theorem 3.4.3. Hence we assume without loss of generality that $\sigma_v \in W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \tau_v)$ for all v .

Recall that $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ is a formally over $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_v, \mathbf{w}_v}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$, where we write $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_v \in Y^{(2,1,0), \tau_{\tilde{v}}}(\mathbb{F})$ for the unique Kisin module such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_v) = \bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}$. By letting $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{v,i} (4 - \ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}))$, the latter ring is a formally smooth over $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\otimes}_{j=1}^N \mathcal{O}[[x_j, y_j]]/(x_j y_j - p)$ by [LLHLM, §5.3.2] and the assumption that $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \geq 2$ for all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, f_v - 1\}$.

For $\sigma' = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v \in W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$, as in the paragraph before Lemma 3.5.6, there exists an N -tuple $(z_j(\sigma'))_j \in \{x_j, y_j\}^N$ so that if $I(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (z_j(\sigma'))_j + (\varpi) \subset R$, then $\mathfrak{p}(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v) R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v) = \text{Ann}_{R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)}(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v)) = I(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma'_v) R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$. By Lemma 3.5.6,

$$(5.6) \quad \#(\{z_j(\sigma_1)\}_j \Delta \{z_j(\sigma_2)\}_j) = 2 \sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_{1,v}, \sigma_{2,v}).$$

Assume without loss of generality that $I(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v)$ is generated by ϖ and $\{x_j\}_j$. Let $\sigma_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_{1,v} \in W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$ be such that $\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} d_{\text{gph}}(\sigma_v, \sigma_{1,v}) = 1$. Furthermore, fix a saturated inclusion $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_{1,v}} \hookrightarrow \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}$. Letting $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ and $M_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_{1,v}})$, we have a map $M_1 \rightarrow M$. By Proposition 4.3.3, $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v} / \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_{1,v}}$ is p -torsion. Then Theorem 4.1.2 describes the Jordan–Hölder factors of this quotient. Let $x_{j_1} \in \{z_j(\sigma)\}_j \Delta \{z_j(\sigma_1)\}_j$. By (5.6), $x_{j_1} \in I(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma''_v)$ for any $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma''_v \in \text{JH}(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v} / \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_{1,v}})$. By Lemma 3.5.2, we see that $\text{coker}(M_1 \rightarrow M)$ is killed by $x_{j_1} \in \{z_j(\sigma)\}_j \Delta \{z_j(\sigma_1)\}_j$. Similarly, we have that $\text{coker}(pM \rightarrow M_1)$ is annihilated by y_{j_1} . Hence we have inclusions $x_{j_1} M \subset M_1$ and $y_{j_1} M_1 \subset pM$. Combining these, we have that $pM = x_{j_1} y_{j_1} M \subset y_{j_1} M_1 \subset pM$. We conclude that the above inclusions are equalities.

Applying the above argument for all $\sigma_1 \in W^?(\bar{r}, \bar{\tau})$ at distance one from σ , we have that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma_v) \cong M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) / ((\varpi) + (x_i)_i)$. The left hand side, and hence the right hand side, is cyclic by Lemma 5.2.2. We conclude that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \bar{\tau}_v^{\sigma_v})$ is cyclic by Nakayama's lemma. $\square$

For all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let $s_{\bar{v}} \in W(\underline{G}_{\bar{v}})$ and $\mu_{\bar{v}} \in X^*(\underline{T}_{\bar{v}})$ be such that $V(\bar{\rho}_{\bar{v}}) = R_{s_{\bar{v}}}(\mu_{\bar{v}} + \underline{1})$ (where $\underline{G}_{\bar{v}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Res}_{k_{\bar{v}}/\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathbf{GL}_3)$). In particular, we see by Proposition 3.3.7 that $\tau_v = R_{s_{\bar{v}}(\mathbf{w}_v^*)^{-1}}(\mu_{\bar{v}} + \underline{1})$.

As in Section 2.2, let $\sigma_{(\omega, a)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mathfrak{I}\mathbf{r}_\mu((s_{\bar{v}}\omega, a)))$ (where $(s_{\bar{v}}\omega, a) \in \Lambda_W^\mu \times \mathcal{A}$). Then $W^?(\bar{\rho}_{\bar{v}}) = \{\sigma_{(\omega, a)} : (\omega, a) \in r(\Sigma)\}$. Similarly, the translation map induces a bijection $s_{\bar{v}}(\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_v)$.

In what follows, we let V_v be a quotient of $\bar{\tau}_v^{\sigma_v}$. We assume that there exist subsets $\Sigma_{V_v, i} \subseteq (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0)$ such that

$$\prod_i \Sigma_{V_v, i} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{JH}(V_v)$$

$$(\omega, a) \mapsto \sigma_{(\omega, a)} = F(\mathfrak{I}\mathbf{r}_\mu((s_{\bar{v}}\omega, a)))$$

is a bijection.

In the following lemmas, we use a gluing procedure to obtain the cyclicity of $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$, inducting on the complexity of the set $W^?(\bar{r}, \tau)$. In tables 11, 12, 13 and 15 we give pictorial realization of the gluing procedure employed in the proof of Lemma 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.7 respectively.

Lemma 5.2.4. *For all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let V_v be as above. Suppose that either $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) > 1$ or $\Sigma_{V_v,i} \subset \{(\omega, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0), (\omega_2, 0)\}$ for some $\omega \in \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2\}$.*

Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is a cyclic $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ -module.

Proof. Note that by condition (5.5) one has $(\omega, 1) \in \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ whenever $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \leq 1$. Let $\bar{\Sigma}_{V_v,i}$ be the image of $\Sigma_{V_v,i}$ in $\Lambda_W^{\mu_{\tilde{v}}}$ under the natural projection. We proceed by induction on

$$n = \#\{(v, i) : \ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \leq 1 \text{ and } \#\bar{\Sigma}_{V_v,i} = 3\}$$

If $n = 0$ then a casewise check for each v and i shows that there exists a type τ'_v such that

- (1) $\sigma_v \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}'_v)$,
- (2) by letting $\mathbf{w}(\bar{\rho}_{\tilde{v}}, \bar{\tau}'_v) = (\tilde{w}'_{v,i})$ one has $\ell(\tilde{w}'_{v,i}) > 1$ for all i , and
- (3) V_v is a quotient of $\bar{\tau}'^{\sigma_v}_v$.

For example, if $\Sigma_{V_v,i} \subset \{(0, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0)\}$, then one takes $\tilde{w}'_{v,i} = \beta\alpha$ (and the datum of $\tilde{w}'_{v,i}$ for all v and i uniquely determines the type τ'_v). The result now follows from Lemma 5.2.3.

Suppose now that $n > 0$ so that there is a $v' \in \Sigma_p^+$ and $i' \in \{0, \dots, f_v - 1\}$ such that $\#\bar{\Sigma}_{V_{v'},i'} = 3$. Since for each v the Alperin diagram of V_v is predicted by the extension graph, there are quotients V_v^1 and V_v^2 of V_v which are uniquely characterized (up to exchanging the roles of V_v^1 and V_v^2) by the following properties:

- (1) $\Sigma_{V_v,i} = \Sigma_{V_v,i}^1 \cup \Sigma_{V_v,i}^2$,
- (2) $\Sigma_{V_v,i}^j = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ for all $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$ and $j = 1, 2$, and
- (3) $\#\bar{\Sigma}_{V_{v'},i'}^1, \#\bar{\Sigma}_{V_{v'},i'}^2 = 2$.

For example, if $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'} = \{(0, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0), (\omega_2, 0)\}$, then one takes $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^1 = \{(0, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0)\}$ and $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^2 = \{(0, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_2, 0)\}$ (cf. Table 11).

By the inductive hypothesis, $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1)$ and $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$ are cyclic. Let V_v^3 be the quotient of V_v^1 and V_v^2 such that $\Sigma_{V_v,i}^3 = \Sigma_{V_v,i}^1 \cap \Sigma_{V_v,i}^2$. Let I_j be $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^j)$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. By (1), we have an injection $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v \hookrightarrow (\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1) \times (\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$. In fact, this injection lands in $(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1) \times_{(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^3)} (\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$. Comparing lengths, we see that the injection $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v \hookrightarrow (\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1) \times_{(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^3)} (\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$ is in fact an isomorphism, which, using

the exactness of M_∞ (see Definition 3.4.1), gives the first isomorphism below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v) &\cong M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1) \times_{M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^3)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2) \\
 &\cong R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/I_1 \times_{R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/I_3} R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/I_2 \\
 &\cong R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/I_1 \times_{R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/(I_1+I_2)} R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/I_2 \\
 &\cong R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)/(I_1 \cap I_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

The second isomorphism follows from Lemma 3.5.2. The third isomorphism follows from the fact that $I_1 + I_2 = I_3$ by Lemma 5.1.1. The final isomorphism is formal. We deduce in particular that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is cyclic. (We refer the reader to Table 11 for a pictorial realization of the gluing procedure above.) $\square$

Lemma 5.2.5. *For all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let V_v be as above. Suppose that $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) > 1$ or*

$$\Sigma_{V_v,i} \subset (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\})$$

where (ν_1, ν_2, ν_3) is $(\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega_2)$, $(\omega_2 - \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2)$, or $(\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0, \omega_2 - \omega_1)$. Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is a cyclic $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ -module.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n = \#\{(v, i) : \#(\Sigma_{V_v,i} \cap r(\Sigma_0)) = 5\}$. There is a unique $\tilde{w}'_{v,i}$ such that $(\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\}) = (\tilde{w}'_{v,i})^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \cap ((\tilde{w}'_{v,i})^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0))$. One can check that if $\#((\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\}) \cap \Sigma_0) = 4$, then one of $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i})$ and $\ell(\tilde{w}'_{v,i})$ is strictly greater than one. Changing the types τ_v if necessary, we assume without loss of generality that either $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) > 1$ or $\#((\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\}) \cap r(\Sigma_0)) = 5$. Suppose that $n = 0$. If $\ell(\tilde{w}'_{v,i}) \leq 1$, then $\Sigma_{V_v,i} \cap r(\Sigma_0) \subset \{(\omega, 1), (0, 0), (\omega_1, 0), (\omega_2, 0)\}$ where $\omega = 0, \omega_1$, or ω_2 by considerations of submodule structure. Hence, for all v , there is a quotient V'_v of V_v such that V'_v is of the form in Lemma 5.2.4 and the induced map $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v) \rightarrow M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V'_v)$ is an isomorphism. We are then done by Lemma 5.2.4.

Suppose now that $n > 0$. Suppose that $\#(\Sigma_{V_{v',i'}} \cap r(\Sigma_0)) = 5$. Then for each v , V_v has a unique quotient V_v^1 such that $\Sigma_{V_v^1,i}^1 = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ if $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$ and $\Sigma_{V_v^1,i'}^1 = \Sigma_{V_{v',i'}} \setminus \{(\nu_4, 1)\}$ where $\nu_4 = 0, \omega_1$, or ω_2 and $\nu_4 \neq \nu_2$ (cf. Table 12 for an example in the particular case where $\tilde{w}_{v',i'} = \text{id}$). Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1)$ is cyclic by the induction hypothesis. For each v , there is also a submodule $V_v^2 \subset V_v$ such that $\Sigma_{V_v^2,i}^2 = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ if $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$ and $\Sigma_{V_v^2,i'}^2 = \Sigma_{V_{v',i'}} \cap r(\Sigma_0)$ and $(\nu_4, 1) \in \Sigma_{V_{v',i'}}^2$ (cf. Table 12). One can check that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$ is cyclic by the inductive hypothesis. Then letting $M'' = \ker(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v) \twoheadrightarrow M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1))$ and $M' = M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$, [EGS15, Lemma 10.1.13] implies that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is cyclic. $\square$

Lemma 5.2.6. *For all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let V_v be as above. Suppose furthermore that $\ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) > 1$ or $\Sigma_{V_v,i} \subset (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu, 0)\})$ where ν is $\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_2 - \omega_1$, or $\omega_1 + \omega_2$. Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is cyclic.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on

$$n = \#\{(v, i) : \ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \leq 1 \text{ and } \Sigma_{V_v,i} \not\subset (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\})\}$$

$$(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) = (\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega_2), (\omega_2 - \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2), \text{ and } (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0, \omega_2 - \omega_1)\}.$$

The case $n = 0$ is covered by Lemma 5.2.5. Suppose that $n > 0$, and that

$$\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'} \not\subset (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu_1, 0), (\nu_2, 1), (\nu_3, 0)\})$$

for $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) \in \{(\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega_2), (\omega_2 - \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1 + \omega_2), (\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0, \omega_2 - \omega_1)\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\nu = \omega_1 + \omega_2$. For each v , there are quotients V_v^1 and V_v^2 of V_v such that

- (1) $\Sigma_{V_v,i} = \Sigma_{V_v,i}^1 \cup \Sigma_{V_v,i}^2$,
- (2) $\Sigma_{v,i}^j = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ for $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$ and $j = 1, 2$,
- (3) $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^1 \subset (\tilde{w}_{v',i'}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\omega_1 - \omega_2, 0), (\omega_1, 1), (\omega_1 + \omega_2, 0)\})$, and
- (4) $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^2 \subset (\tilde{w}_{v',i'}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\omega_2 - \omega_1, 0), (\omega_2, 1), (\omega_1 + \omega_2, 0)\})$

(cf. 13 for an example when $\tilde{w}_{v',i'} = \alpha$). Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1)$ and $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^2)$ are cyclic by the induction hypothesis. We now argue as in the proof of Lemma 5.2.4 using Lemmas 5.1.3 and 5.1.5. Note that the analogue of Lemma 5.1.5 for the shapes β and γ hold symmetrically. $\square$

Lemma 5.2.7. *For all $v \in \Sigma_p^+$, let V_v be as above. Then $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v)$ is a cyclic $R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$ -module.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on

$$n = \#\{(v, i) : \ell(\tilde{w}_{v,i}) \leq 1 \text{ and } \Sigma_{V_v,i} \not\subset (\tilde{w}_{v,i}^*)^{-1}(\Sigma_0 \setminus \{(\nu, 0)\}) \text{ for } \nu = \omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_2 - \omega_1, \text{ and } \omega_1 + \omega_2\}.$$

The case $n = 0$ is covered by Lemma 5.2.6. Suppose that $n > 0$. Then for each v , V_v has a quotient V_v^1 such that $\Sigma_{V_v,i}^1 = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ if $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$ and $\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^1 = \Sigma_{V_{v'},i'} \setminus \{(\tilde{w}_{v',i'}^*)^{-1}(\nu, 0)\}$ where $\nu = \omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_2 - \omega_1$, or $\omega_1 + \omega_2$ (cf. Table 15 for an example when $\tilde{w}_{v',i'} = \gamma$). If the map $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v) \rightarrow M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} V_v^1)$ is an isomorphism, we are done. Otherwise, for each v , there is a submodule V_v^2 of V_v such that $\Sigma_{V_v,i}^2 = \Sigma_{V_v,i}$ if $(v, i) \neq (v', i')$, $\#\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^2 = \#(\Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^2 \cap r(\Sigma_0)) = 2$, and $(\tilde{w}_{v',i'}^*)^{-1}(\nu, 0) \in \Sigma_{V_{v'},i'}^2 \subset r(\Sigma_0)$. Then one argues as in the proof of Lemma 5.2.5. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.2.1. By Nakayama's lemma, it suffices to show that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \bar{\tau}_v^{\sigma_v})$ is cyclic.

This follows from Lemma 5.2.7. $\square$

5.3. Gauges for patching functors. In this subsection, we compute the image of maps between patched modules for lattices. This can be viewed as a calculation of lattice gauges in families. We remark that main ingredient for this section is Theorem 5.2.1, after which algebro-geometric arguments using the adjunction formula and the Cohen–Macaulay property prove Theorem 5.3.3. We learned these arguments from M. Emerton.

Let $X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Spec}(R_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_{\tilde{v}}))$. It is a normal and Cohen–Macaulay scheme (cf. [LLHLM, Corollaries 8.6 and 8.10]). Let $Z \subset X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}})$ be the locus of points lying on two irreducible components of the special fiber of $X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}})$. Note that the codimension of $Z \subset X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}})$ is two. Let

$$j : U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}}) \setminus Z \hookrightarrow X_\infty(\tau_{\tilde{v}})$$

be the natural open immersion.

Lemma 5.3.1. *The scheme U is regular.*

Proof. The special fiber $\overline{U}$ of U is regular by the explicit description of $\overline{R}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{w}_j}^{\text{expl}, \nabla}$ in [LLHLM, Table 6 and §8]. The dimension of the tangent space of U at a characteristic p point is at most one more than the dimension of the tangent space of U at that point. By p -flatness, the Krull dimension of U is one more than the Krull dimension of $\overline{U}$, and so U is regular at characteristic p points. Since the generic fiber of U , which is isomorphic to the generic fiber of X_∞ , is regular, U is regular. $\square$

Lemma 5.3.2. *Let $\sigma'_v \in \text{JH}(\tau_v)$. If $\kappa_v \in W^?(\overline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}})$ for all v , let $m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)$ be the multiplicity with which $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v$ appears in the cokernel of an injection $\iota : \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v} \hookrightarrow \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}$. Then the induced injection $j^* M_\infty(\iota) : j^* M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v}) \hookrightarrow j^* M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ has image*

$$j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right).$$

Proof. Note that $j^*(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}))$ is locally free (of rank one), since it is Cohen–Macaulay of full support over the regular scheme U (see Definition 3.4.1). Then the image of $j^* M_\infty(\iota)$ is $J \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_U} j^*(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}))$ where J is the ideal sheaf of the Cartier divisor corresponding to the cokernel of $j^* M_\infty(\iota)$. It is easily seen that $J = j^* \left(\prod_{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right)$.

Finally, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right) \\
 &= j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right) j^* \left(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right) \\
 &\cong j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_U} j^* \left(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the isomorphism again follows from the fact that $j^*(M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}))$ is locally free. $\square$

For each v , fix a weight σ_v as in Theorem 5.2.1 so that $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ is cyclic.

Theorem 5.3.3. *Let $\sigma'_v \in \text{JH}(\tau_v)$. Suppose that a weight $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v$ appears with multiplicity $m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)$ in the cokernel of an injection $\iota : \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v} \hookrightarrow \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}$. Then the induced injection $M_\infty(\iota) : M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma'_v}) \hookrightarrow M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ has image*

$$j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right) M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}).$$

Proof. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a Cohen–Macaulay sheaf on $X_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$, then $j_* j^* \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}$ since the codimension of Z is two. Hence the image of $M_\infty(\iota)$ is

$$j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right)$$

by Lemma 5.3.2. Since $M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v})$ is free over $X_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}) \right) \\
 &= j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\substack{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})}} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right) M_\infty(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v^{\sigma_v}).
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

5.4. Global applications. In this subsection, we deduce generalizations of Breuil's conjectures on mod p multiplicity one and lattices. Theorem 5.4.1 follows immediately from Theorem 5.2.1. While Theorem 5.4.4 also follows formally from Theorem 5.3.3, we note that it is crucial in our manipulations with M_∞ that the image of the map between two patched modules given in Theorem 5.3.3 is described by an ideal. This is far from formal, and again relies crucially on Theorem 5.2.1.

We use a setup similar to that in Section 7 of [LLHLM]. Let $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ be an automorphic Galois representation that satisfies the Taylor–Wiles conditions in the sense of Definition 7.3 of [LLHLM]. Assume furthermore that

- the extension F/F^+ is unramified at all finite places;
- If $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is ramified at a place w of F , then $v = w|_{F^+}$ splits as ww^c (split ramification); and
- p is unramified in F^+ .

Note that a weak patching functor M_∞ which satisfies the conditions of [LLHLM, Definition 7.11] exists, which we now fix, by Proposition 7.15 of [LLHLM].

5.4.1. Mod p multiplicity one. By construction in [Le, §4.2], $M_\infty(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)/\mathfrak{m} \cong (S(U, \bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma \otimes W)[\mathfrak{m}])^*$ where W corresponds to the reduction of certain inertial types away from p . We have the following mod p multiplicity one result.

Theorem 5.4.1. *Let σ be a weight as in Theorem 5.2.1. Then the $\mathbb{F}$ -dimension of $S(U, \bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma \otimes W)[\mathfrak{m}]$ is one.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.2.1, the dimension of $M_\infty(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)/\mathfrak{m}$ is one. □

5.4.2. Lattices in cohomology.

Theorem 5.4.2. *Let $r : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(E)$ be an absolutely irreducible automorphic Galois representation such that*

- (1) *p is unramified in F^+ , and for all places $w \in \Sigma_p$, $\bar{r}|_{I_{F_w}}$ is semisimple;*
- (2) *for all places $w \in \Sigma_p$, the representation $r|_{G_{F_w}}$ is potentially crystalline, with parallel Hodge type $(2, 1, 0)$ and with strongly generic tame inertial type $\tau_{\Sigma_p^+} = \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \tau_v$ (see [LLHLM, Definition 2.1]);*
- (3) *$\bar{r}$ satisfies the Taylor–Wiles conditions as above and $\bar{r}$ has split ramification; and*
- (4) *$\bar{r} \cong \bar{r}_\iota(\pi)$ for a RACSDC representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{A}_F)$ with trivial infinitesimal character such that $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \sigma(\tau_v)$ is a K -type for $\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \pi_v$.*

Then r is automorphic in the sense of [LLHLM, §7.2].

Proof. Given Theorem 3.4.13, the proof of [LLHLM, Theorem 7.4] goes through unchanged. In particular, for any generic type τ , $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0, 1, 2)}$ has connected generic fiber. □

Remark 5.4.3. Compared to [LLHLM, Theorem 7.4], we relaxed the hypothesis that p splits completely to p being unramified. However, we also assumed that $\bar{r}$ is semisimple at all places above

p . The reason is that we only established the connectedness of the generic fiber of $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square, \tau, (0,1,2)}$ when $\bar{\tau}$ is non-semisimple in general (though we do know it in the case that all shapes have length ≥ 2). In work in progress, we will establish a counterpart of [LLHLM, Theorem 7.4] for non-semisimple representations. This will allow us to remove the semisimplicity hypothesis in a manner similar to [LLHLM, Theorem 7.4].

If W is an $\mathcal{O}$ -module endowed with an action of a compact open subgroup $U^p \subset G(\mathbb{A}_{F^+}^{\infty, p})$, define

$$S(U^p, W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{U_p} S(U^p U_p, W) \text{ and } \tilde{S}(U^p, W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varprojlim_s S(U^v, W/\varpi^s).$$

Suppose that r as in 5.4.2 is minimally ramified at all finite places in the sense of [CHT08, Definition 2.4.14]. Let W be the tensor product of the inertial types corresponding to the ramification of $\bar{\tau}$ away from p . Following the notation of [LLHLM], 7.1, let λ be the kernel of the system of Hecke eigenvalues $\alpha : \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ associated to r , i.e. α satisfies the equality

$$\det(1 - r^{\vee}(\text{Frob}_w)X) = \sum_{j=0}^3 (-1)^j (\mathbf{N}_{F_w/\mathbb{Q}_\ell}(w))^{(j)} \bar{\alpha}(T_w^{(j)}) X^j$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{P}$ (letting $\ell := w|_{\mathbb{Q}}$). By Theorem 5.4.2, $\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda]$ is nonzero. Since r is minimally ramified, r corresponds to a prime ideal of R_{∞} as in [HLM, Theorem 5.2.1]. By an abuse of notation, we call this ideal λ . Note that we have that $M_{\infty}/\lambda \cong \tilde{S}(U^p, W)^{\text{d}}/\lambda$ by (the proof of) [CEG⁺, Corollary 2.11].

Theorem 5.4.4. *The lattice $\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\Sigma_p^+} \cap \tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda] \subset \tau_{\Sigma_p^+} \cap \tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda][p^{-1}] \cong \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}$ depends only on $\{r|_{\bar{v}}\}_{v \in \Sigma_p^+}$.*

Proof. Fix $\sigma \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+})$ as in Theorem 5.2.1, a saturated inclusion $\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma} \subset \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^0$, and saturated inclusions $\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'} \subset \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma}$ for all $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+})$. Let $\gamma(\sigma') \in \mathcal{O}$ so that $\gamma(\sigma')^{-1} \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'} \subset \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^0$ is saturated. Then $\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^0 = \sum_{\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+})} \gamma(\sigma')^{-1} \tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'}$ for some $\gamma(\sigma') \in \mathcal{O}$ by [EGS15, Lemma 4.1.2]. It suffices to show that for each $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(\bar{\tau}_{\Sigma_p^+})$, the ideal $(\gamma(\sigma')) \subset \mathcal{O}$ depends only on $\{r|_{\bar{v}}\}_{v \in \Sigma_p^+}$.

Observe that the image of the inclusion

$$\mathcal{O} \cong \text{Hom}_{U^p}(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma}, \tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{U^p}(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'}, \tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda]) \cong \mathcal{O},$$

is given by the ideal $(\gamma(\sigma'))$. By Schikhov duality, the natural inclusion

$$\mathcal{O} \cong \text{Hom}_{U^p}((\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda])^{\text{d}}, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma})^{\text{d}}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{U^p}((\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda])^{\text{d}}, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'})^{\text{d}}) \cong \mathcal{O},$$

is also given by the ideal $(\gamma(\sigma'))$. By another application of Schikhov duality, the natural inclusion

$$\mathcal{O} \cong \text{Hom}_{U^p}((\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda])^{\text{d}}, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'})^{\text{d}})^{\text{d}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{U^p}((\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda])^{\text{d}}, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma})^{\text{d}})^{\text{d}} \cong \mathcal{O},$$

is also given by the ideal $(\gamma(\sigma'))$. Since $\tilde{S}(U^p, W)[\lambda]^d$ is canonically isomorphic to the torsion-free part of $\tilde{S}(U^p, W)^d/\lambda$, the ideal $(\gamma(\sigma'))$ gives the inclusion

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{U^p}(M_\infty/\lambda, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'})^d)^d \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{U^p}(M_\infty/\lambda, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)^d)^d.$$

The image of

$$M_\infty(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^{\sigma'})/\lambda \rightarrow M_\infty(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)/\lambda \cong \mathcal{O}$$

is given by

$$j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right) \otimes_{R_\infty} M_\infty(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)/\lambda$$

by Theorem 5.3.3. Again, note that $\mathrm{Hom}_{U^p}(M_\infty/\lambda, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)^d)^d$ is isomorphic to the torsion-free part of $\mathrm{Hom}_{U^p}(M_\infty, (\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)^d)^d/\lambda = M_\infty(\tau_{\Sigma_p^+}^\sigma)$, and similarly for σ' . Since taking torsion-free parts is right-exact, we see that $(\gamma(\sigma'))$ is generated by elements in the ideal


$$j_* j^* \left(\prod_{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} R_\infty \right)$$

modulo the ideal λ . We conclude by noting that


$$\prod_{\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v \in W^?(\bar{r})} \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \mathfrak{p}(\kappa_v) \right)^{m(\otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} \kappa_v)} \subset \otimes_{v \in \Sigma_p^+} R_v^\square.$$

□


TABLE 11. Comparison of V^i and $M_\infty(V^i)$ in Lemma 5.2.4




On the left, in the middle and on the right we draw the Alperin diagram of the representation V^1 , V^3 and V^2 respectively. Note that $M_\infty(\sigma_{(\tilde{w}^{-1}(\omega), 0)}) \neq 0$ if and only if $(\tilde{w}^{-1}(\omega), a) \in r(\Sigma_0)$.

TABLE 12. **Comparison of V and $M_\infty(V)$ in Lemma 5.2.5 when $\tilde{w} = \text{id}$**



Assume $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) = (\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega_2)$ and $\tilde{w} = \text{id}$. Then $\tilde{w} = \alpha$ and $\nu_4 = \omega_2$. On the left the Alperin diagram of V , in the middle that of V^1 , on the right that of V^2 (a Weyl segment). In red are the modular weights appearing in V, V^i

 TABLE 13. **Comparison of V^i and $M_\infty(V^i)$ in Lemma 5.2.6 when $\tilde{w} = \alpha$**


In the notation of Lemma 5.2.6 consider the case where $\nu = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ and $\tilde{w} = \alpha$. On the left, we draw the submodule structure of the representation V^2 , in red the modular weights. Similarly on the right, for V^1 .

 TABLE 14. **Comparison of V^i and $M_\infty(V^i)$ in Lemma 5.2.6 when $\tilde{w} = \gamma$**


In the notation of Lemma 5.2.6 consider the case where $\nu = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ and $\tilde{w} = \gamma$. On the left, we draw the submodule structure of the representation V^2 , and in red the modular weights. Similarly on the right for V^1 .

TABLE 15. **Comparison of V^i and $M_\infty(V^i)$ in Lemma 5.2.7 when $\tilde{w} = \gamma$**


In the notation of Lemma 5.2.7 consider the case where $\nu = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ and $\tilde{w} = \gamma$. On the left, we draw the submodule structure of the representation V (resp. its quotient V^1 removing the dotted lower part), in red the modular weights. On the right one of the possible choices for V^2 .

REFERENCES

- [Alp86] J. L. Alperin, *Local representation theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 11, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986, Modular representations as an introduction to the local representation theory of finite groups. MR 860771 (87i:20002)
- [AM01] Henning Haahr Andersen and Kaneda Masaharu, *Filtrations on G_1T -modules*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **82** (2001), no. 3, 614–646. MR 1816691
- [And87] Henning Haahr Andersen, *Extensions of simple modules for finite Chevalley groups*, J. Algebra **111** (1987), no. 2, 388–403. MR 916175 (89b:20089)
- [BDM15] C. Bowman, S. R. Doty, and S. Martin, *Decomposition of tensor products of modular irreducible representations for SL_3 : the $p \geq 5$ case*, Int. Electron. J. Algebra **17** (2015), 105–138. MR 3310689
- [BP13] C. Breuil and V. Paskunas, *Towards a modulo p langlands correspondence for GL_2* , vol. 2016, Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc., 2013.
- [Bre14] Christophe Breuil, *Sur un problème de compatibilité local-global modulo p pour GL_2* , J. Reine Angew. Math. **692** (2014), 1–76. MR 3274546
- [CDT99] Brian Conrad, Fred Diamond, and Richard Taylor, *Modularity of certain potentially Barsotti-Tate Galois representations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), no. 2, 521–567. MR 1639612 (99i:11037)
- [CEG⁺] Ana Caraiani, Matthew Emerton, Toby Gee, David Geraghty, Vytautas Paskunas, and Sug Woo Shin, *Patching and p -adic local Langlands*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.0831>, preprint (2013).
- [CHT08] Laurent Clozel, Michael Harris, and Richard Taylor, *Automorphy for some l -adic lifts of automorphic mod l Galois representations*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. (2008), no. 108, 1–181, With Appendix A, summarizing unpublished work of Russ Mann, and Appendix B by Marie-France Vignéras. MR 2470687 (2010j:11082)
- [CL] Ana Caraiani and Brandon Levin, *Moduli of Kisin modules with descent data and parahoric local models*, <http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~bwlevin/CLparahoric.pdf>, preprint (2015).
- [Dia97] Fred Diamond, *The Taylor-Wiles construction and multiplicity one*, Invent. Math. **128** (1997), no. 2, 379–391. MR 1440309 (98c:11047)
- [EG14] Matthew Emerton and Toby Gee, *A geometric perspective on the Breuil-Mézard conjecture*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **13** (2014), no. 1, 183–223. MR 3134019
- [EGS15] Matthew Emerton, Toby Gee, and David Savitt, *Lattices in the cohomology of Shimura curves*, Invent. Math. **200** (2015), no. 1, 1–96. MR 3323575
- [GHS] Toby Gee, Florian Herzig, and David Savitt, *General Serre weight conjectures*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02527>, preprint (2015).
- [Her09] Florian Herzig, *The weight in a Serre-type conjecture for tame n -dimensional Galois representations*, Duke Math. J. **149** (2009), no. 1, 37–116. MR 2541127 (2010f:11083)
- [HLM] Florian Herzig, Daniel Le, and Stefano Morra, *On mod p local-global compatibility for GL_3 in the ordinary case*, In preparation (2015).
- [Hum06] James E. Humphreys, *Modular representations of finite groups of Lie type*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 326, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. MR 2199819 (2007f:20023)

- [Jan03] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, second ed., Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 107, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. MR 2015057 (2004h:20061)
- [Kis08] Mark Kisin, *Potentially semi-stable deformation rings*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **21** (2008), no. 2, 513–546. MR 2373358 (2009c:11194)
- [Le] Daniel Le, *Lattices in the cohomology of $U(3)$ arithmetic manifolds*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.04766>, preprint (2015).
- [LLHLM] Daniel Le, Bao Viet Le Hung, Brandon Levin, and Stefano Morra, *Potentially crystalline deformation rings: Shapes and shadows*, in preparation (2015).
- [Pil93] Cornelius Pillen, *Reduction modulo p of some Deligne-Lusztig characters*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **61** (1993), no. 5, 421–433. MR 1241047 (94i:20026)
- [Pil97] ———, *Loewy series for principal series representations of finite Chevalley groups*, J. Algebra **189** (1997), no. 1, 101–124. MR 1432367 (98a:20019)
- [Vig96] Marie-France Vignéras, *Représentations l -modulaires d'un groupe réductif p -adique avec $l \neq p$* , Progress in Mathematics, vol. 137, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996. MR 1395151

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 40 ST. GEORGE STREET, TORONTO, ON M5S 2E4, CANADA

E-mail address: `le@math.toronto.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 5734 S. UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637, USA

E-mail address: `lhvietbao@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 5734 S. UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637, USA

E-mail address: `bwlevin@math.uchicago.edu`

INSTITUT MONTPELLIÉRAIN A. GROTHENDIECK, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTPELLIER, CC 051, PLACE E. BATAILLON, 34095 MONTPELLIER CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: `stefano.morra@umontpellier.fr`